

To whom it may concern

Climate change is a huge threat to our country, bigger than all others as it threatens the lives and welfare of all the generations to come.

Lets forget short term politics and think of the future of the planet. Get the policies in place required to reverse the effects of our habitation on planet earth.

Most people agree that it needs to be done so go for it.

Best of luck

Greg Venning

I am concerned that the CPRS is badly designed and the 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

i believe that this scheme will allow industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Therefore I urge the Government to take into account the rapidly changing evidence of climate change and revisit the objectives of the CPRS and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020(on 1990 levels).

So much could be done to both reduce climate change and boost jobs if the target was set much higher.

Green jobs in solar, water harvesting, public transport, energy efficiency, green vehicles, etc. could simultaneously boost energy savings and create jobs.

Why can't the government see this - are they so taken over by the lobbies for the status quo that they are either blind or stupid - or both??

Change would be good.

No more voting for Lab/Lib coalition on looming disaster.

Yours disappointedly

Dr John Grant

Dear Senators,

Please do your bit to set Australia on a course to a positive future. Surely we can all agree climate change is happening and it is time to change the status-quo? We need climate change policies that recognise the urgent need for big reductions in GHG and soon! The science is clear so we have no excuse to deny what is happening.

I feel strongly that the Government's proposed CPRS scheme is flawed and that the proposed targets are far too low. We need a system that encourages voluntary GHG abatement by communities and small business, and we need a system that does not set a floor to Australia's emissions. Furthermore we need targets that reflect the reality of what is happening in the real world of our atmospheric systems. As the science tells us we should aim for cuts of 50%, not 5%!

I think the Government is neglecting its responsibility to take serious action so Australia can do it's part to mitigate climate change. Equally importantly I feel setting high targets for GHG reduction will help stimulate our industry to become leaders in innovative technologies and approaches to become more energy and resource efficient. It is time to move on from the fossil fuel age, just as we did the stone age. The Government is letting down our society and generations to follow. Please help to create a policy that can make a difference.

I should add that most people I know in my local community share a similar point of view.

Kind Regards,

Dr Daniel Handley

Dear Sir/Madam

Science is telling us loud and clear of the dangers we face as a nation and world due to rising levels of GHG in the atmosphere, Science is also telling us the amount of reductions required to reduce the impact of climate change. The current level of targets proposed by the Aus federal government is far below the targets that good science is telling us we need to achieve.

Please use science fact as the formulae to agree on GHG reduction targets which are in the vicinity of 25%-40% by 2020 and 80% by 2050.

Much appreciated

Ian Richardson Manly Brisbane

Dear political leaders,

Having looked at the lessons learned from Europe's market-based CPRS, I submit that the Australian governments proposed scheme will fall well short of target. Further I submit that it will ensure that even the 5% target will not be met. On my estimate it will deliver a negative abatement of about 15 percent. That is, 15 percent growth over and above base rather than a 5 percent reduction.

A tighter CPRS could, of course deliver better results, but the fault lies in the fact that government has little control over the market. Market forces have overt power of persuasion, not only on this government but on any future government. And the market is always subject to the creation of loopholes.

I submit that a far more simple and straightforward regime of carbon taxation would be much more efficacious in delivering real abatement. Taxing carbon at source or point of sale is much fairer and less subject to loopholes and manipulation of government.

This issue is far too serious to get it wrong.

Thanking you,

Chris Harries

Hello,

please note that to keep warming below a rise of 2 degree C that GHG levels must not rise above 450 ppm , we are currently just below 390 ppm, Should the upper target of 15% reduction be retained and adopted by the rest of the world then we can expect to see GHG levels of 530 ppm at this level runaway global warming will definitely be occurring and temperature increases of over 5 degrees will be a certainty.

Regarding the proposed REC's multiplier to take the place of the current solar rebate scheme, should this proposal be enshrined in legislation, the result will be a reduction in Australia's RET of 20%, as for every MW of small renewable generation 4 additional "phantom" MW will be created that polluters will be able to utilise with no equivalent reduction in GHG reduction or actual renewable energy being created.

This scheme must be tossed out and a gross high value feed in tariff introduced

Thank you

Jim Thomson

We need to set high % targets. 5% reduction is not good enough.

We need to show the World that we as Australian care for our planet.

We need to show how we can reduce our energy consumption and safe our enviroment.

We need to forward plan for our Great Great Grandchildren or there will be nothing left, to save.

Leonard Lester

The Government's weak target of 5-15% is completely inadequate. By the time we start to feel the full effects of climate change, it will be too late, and significant changes need to be made now. It's not fair that individuals are doing what they can to reduce their carbon footprint whilst the big polluters can buy their way around it. They need strong reasons now to change their methods.

Please please please review these targets.

Best

Claire

I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the Government's currently proposed 5-15% reduction of greenhouse pollution. The more studies that are reported, the more it seems that the global situation is deteriorating more rapidly than previously thought. I urge the Government to increase the target reduction to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020. I would also urge that the current Carbon Pollution Reduction strategy be replaced by a tax on carbon outputs. In its present form, the CPRS favours big polluters in that they can purchase carbon credits from individuals who are doing the right thing by installing renewable energy systems. It is for this reason that I for one, refuse to trade the carbon credits that I am entitled to from the installation of a solar system in my house.

If the Government has the initiative and the will to stand up to big business interests, it can put Australia in the box seat with respect to renewable technology and gain many economic benefits. Its current strategy will once again see us falling behind the rest of the world, especially when regarding America's changing stance.

Dai Knowles

We elected the Rudd government because, crucially, unlike the Coalition, it promised to deal meaningfully with climate change. The 5 per cent target now offered is an insult to our intelligence. It is indeed no more than a re-elected Howard government would have done as a sop to public opinion and arguably less than Malcolm Turnbull could do.

Was meaningful action on climate change a "non-core" promise? Or is the ALP no different in government than the Coalition when it comes to environmental necessities?

Mr Rudd, please demonstrate, and soon, that your government is not in the thrall of the coal lobby and its denialist spin doctors. Otherwise my vote (and the votes of my large, diverse and deeply disillusioned family) will go in future to the Greens with Coalition and Independent preferences. After all, if you are no different from the Coalition on a matter of such overwhelming global significance, why should we vote for you rather than them?

Give me a reason to vote you back in or I shall not do so.

Sincerely and in sorrow and anger

Juliette Hughes

After a very promising vision for dealing with climate change before the last elections, the government's current response is underwhelming.

I am calling for a commitment to reducing greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Please let's see Australia take a leading role in dealing with this crisis and find a way forward for our planet.

Regards,
Matthew Magnus

Australia needs to take strong action on climate change. As more and more science shows, climate change is happening more rapidly than had been imagined, so urgent and dramatic action is necessary. The threat of catastrophic climate change is increasingly dire. We need to be lead by the science on this issue, and commit to making changes that will achieve the reductions that the science indicates are necessary: not take half measures in order to placate industries with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. Half measures are not enough given how dire the threat is, and we should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Australia also needs to set high targets to set an example that will give us a convincing bargaining position in future international negotiations in Copenhagen.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme appears poorly designed. As it stands, it appears to overcompensate polluters. Carbon intensive industries have had plenty of warning that change is necessary. Overcompensating them now at this late stage them will undermine the rapid transition to sustainable technologies that is needed. Neither are trading schemes like the CPRS sufficient in themselves - they need to be accompanied by a range of government lead schemes that encourage energy savings and the transition to renewable technologies.

Daniel McLoughlin

5-15% is not enough to been seen as a world leader for a green future. I want Australia to been seen as a shining example for other countries to aspire to!!

Angela Jackson

Leaders,

Our emission reduction targets are weak. Australia can influence some of the highest polluting countries, China for example, by setting exemplary targets and achieving outstanding results. Until these polluting countries reduce their own emissions, the entire world will suffer from their poor response to Climate Change.

It is our duty to put pressure on these countries.

Australia must take a hard-hitting approach, exempting no industry from reducing its footprint. Our entire culture must change and adapt to this new way of living. It is unrealistic to allow industries such as mining, forestry and transport to be exempt from reducing emissions. Just as cigarette and alcohol companies must move with the times and face reality, so must the polluting industries responsible for the destruction of our planet.

Neither should the carbon-conscious householder's efforts be in vain, nor should their actions be for the benefit of big polluting companies.

Australia's actions must be bold, brave and exemplary.

Our country's future depends on it.

Yours sincerely

Madeline Southey

Climate change is a reality and the biggest threat to lifestyle, safety and our children's future.

While an economic crisis hurts those it effects, climate change will hurt our world forever.

Species will become extinct, floods and famines will increase and we will be sentencing our children and their children to a dangerous world.

Job security should never be prioritised over survival.

We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. This isn't an optional reduction - it's vital for the future of Australia and all Australians.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Katherine Lyall-Watson

After much pre-election hype, I am deeply disappointed by the Governments proposed CO2 reduction targets. 5-15% is not nearly high enough to affect climate change and as a thinking Australian, I am ashamed of this proposal. The proposed CPRS is market-driven, with all the risks that that entails. It will foster a plethora of devious offset schemes that will be hard to monitor, all designed to avoid changing behaviour. Also it does not encourage a groundswell of cooperation from ordinary citizens. As a concerned citizen, I demand better!

Barry Lees

Dear senators,

the government's 5% proposed cut is simply not enough. In the long term, it is not enough to make an effective reduction to Australia's disproportionately large contribution to global warming. This effect may not come within the current electoral cycle.

I want to warn you of a negative effect that probably will. When other economically advanced countries (which also often means disproportionate CO2 contributors) make more meaningful cuts, they will start to look at ways to enforce effective cuts elsewhere, so that their own painful cuts are not wasted. Economic sanctions are an obvious method.

Countries will reduce their buying from carbon-greedy countries. Tourists will tend to avoid such countries.

Let Australia be part of the solution, not a disproportionately large part of the problem.

Joe Wolfe

I wish to ask that the Government rethink its 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid climate change. When elected this Govt. took an excellent stand on climate change. Please do not abandon this stand and increase your target so as not to weaken international agreement at the UN Conference in Copenhagen.
Cynthia Foa

We expect much better, more committed and faster action on this world-saving problem.

You're doing and thinking well on so many difficult issues (thank you!) but this one is still too weak, unsatisfactory. We're behind you to do better.

G000000000000000000000000!

Dr Anne Schlebaum

Last night it was on the news again: Antarctic ice melting faster than ice cream in the tropical heat!

We can't let short-term economic interests outweigh the chance of health and prosperity for our children, which is exactly what is happening now. We need to take action now and implement a policy based on the precautionary principle - because if we tip the balance there is no going back!

We need a reduction target of 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). This IS possible if the government decides on this most important target!

The Carbon pollution reduction scheme needs a major overhaul to actually do anything good for the environment - not just economic interests! There should definitely NOT be a 'floor' as this only benefits economic interests and punishes individuals and organisations that are trying to do the right thing.

Economic gain is possible by investing in renewable industries. If we do it now, we can export to the rest of the world!

Australia is a great country and we need a great government to stand up and take action now and show the world in Copenhagen that we are the leaders!

Please act now!

Gitte Kragh

I am terribly disappointed that after so much fanfare the Rudd government has opted for a minimalist approach with a reduction target of only 5%. This is a very poor effort in view of the rate of change that seems to be happening now, and is hardly the mettle that we need to show if we are to be up at the forefront with respect to action to mitigate climate change.

All I can say is that come the next Federal election I will be forced to vote Green outright without any flow on preference to the ALP.

It seems such a shame that the Rudd government may be a one term wonder.

John Sweeting

Dear Senators

I am one of millions of Australians who is ready to embrace a drastic rethinking of my life if it means that we can turn around catastrophic climate change for the next generation. We don't believe that your CPRS is going to work, the compensation of polluters is the wrong way to go about it. We must increase the target to at least 50% of 1990 levels, and regain the momentum in the science and technology of green energy that we lost during the Howard years. Supporting these new industries will create jobs and help the economy. Please take action NOW to allow Australia to become one of the countries which will lead others to act likewise. Having the courage and conviction to act now may avert an economic disaster as well as an ecological collapse.

Stephanie Britton AM

I would like to see more ambitious climate change targets introduced by the Federal Government. Please make climate change a higher priority.

Matthew Roberts

I'm extremely worried that the 5-15% target set by our government is not going to be enough. I am also extremely disturbed by the fact that this matter seems to be a case of big business and corporation leading our country, and not our democratic system. Surely the majority of our people would prefer our planet to be a safe and beautiful place to live rather than a destructive wasteland?

It is now estimated by scientists that the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt ENTIRELY within the next FIVE YEARS!! 5-15% will not stop this - we need a commitment to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 ON 1990 LEVELS!

Our country and our world is a beautiful sanctuary, and it is the concern of each and every person to keep it that way - indeed to GREATLY REDUCE the impacts that humans are having on nature and natural ecosystems.

Be strong - set strong targets.

Kind regards,

Hannah Reardon-Smith.

Dear People,

We now seem to be seeing that climate change has moved from a gradual threat to one which is occurring rapidly and at the high end of previous estimations.

Given this, we need to be proceeding with strength and speed. We cannot use the excuse of the economy to defer action, as without action we may not have an economy. Similarly there is no particular reason why companies which have known for years that they were in outmoded industries and done nothing about it should be feather-bedded

Greenhouse reduction targets of less than 20% by 2020 are, in these conditions, ridiculous, and undermine international efforts to get a consensus. It seems that we must act on climate change, without waiting for others, as that is the only way we will get others to act. In any case we are one of the highest per head carbon emitters on the planet, and given our exports are probably even worse.

It is not clear that carbon trading solves the problems as businesses are effectively encouraged to increase carbon emissions, so that they can later decrease them and claim carbon credits. It also makes carbon emissions vulnerable to speculation, overcomplexity and collapse as we see in other financial markets. I also gather that by proposing a floor, the current scheme actually maintains emission levels and prevents them from falling should there be a technological breakthrough or a great effort by the populace.

Furthermore carbon sequestration is unproven, and there is no way I have seen yet even theorised about how we could tell if the CO₂ was leaking from the earth and thus if the sequestration is failing.

At the least the government should be encouraging noncarbon emissions technology - and building sea walls in low lying parts of the coast.

This might indicate it actually believes what is happening.

jon

I believe we urgently need a stronger co2 reduction policy than what is currently on the table. One which leads to a significant emmissions reduction, does not nuetralize the efforts of ordinary people and fosters genuine alternative energy technologies rather than continuing to prop up the fossil fuel industry or take us down the road to nuclear power.

Regards, Mark Elliott.

Australia should be one of the countries setting an example in all areas of climate change instead this rich country is lagging behind countries of equal wealth.

I am asking this government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by a minimum of 60% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels).

The CPRS currently proposed by the government is an outrage; it compensates the worst polluters while leaving the actions addressing pollution to committed individuals.

Many people in my neighbourhood were at the point of installing solar energy but have since found out that their responsible actions would only be used to make big polluters look better. Even though we all would like to make a difference (and in many ways do) we will now not install solar energy.

We know from countries like Germany that it can be done, it can create sustainable employment and is the only socially and economically smart way forward.

Instead of doing everything in its power to ensure a sustainable future for the next generations it appears that the Australian government puts the profit of big industry before the needs of the current community and future communities.

This is not the government we want or need.

Yours sincerely

Ellen Kleimaker

Listen to the evidence, our planet is in jeopardy. In fact, it may well be beyond salvation but we are surely obliged to do our best for the coming generations.

Sincerely,
Tobias Cummings

The current target for emissions reductions is at a level that guarantees irreversible loss of important habitat and disruption to this countries infrastructure due to coastal innundation. Australia must set a stronger target of 50% reduction by 2020, if we are to emerge as a global leader in this area. Our current position undermines our solar power industry which would be boosted and would in turn boost the economy at this crucial time if higher targets were set.

The industries in Australia which are the major polluters need a strong legally binding incentive to begin the necessary steps to move Australia and the world beyon this carbon economic model into one which holds some hope for our children. Focussing on lowering household emissions and consumption is part of the process, but the main thrust must be on the industrial polluters as their emmissions dwarf householders.

The cost of pollution and sustainability must then be passed on to consumers, the first step of this process lies in setting targets that are based on science and not industry lobby groups. I believe that the majority of people want to see a substantial and concrete change in direction befor we lose any more Iconic species.

Dave Reynolds

Hi,

we as a country need to make a more serious effort at reducing our pollution emissions. This will make Australia, and the world, a better place to live for us, and our children. It is more important than jobs, because without a place to live what is the point of a job. If Australia doesn't take advantage of its privileged position as a wealthy country to make a difference when it counts, how can we expect countries less well off than ours to do the same?

Regards,

James Gardner

Dear Sir/Madam

I'm writing in regard to the humiliating targets that have been set by the Australian Government to reduce our greenhouse emissions by 5-15%.

How do you expect Australia to be seen as as a serious voice at the table when we choose such ridiculously low targets. We have to bite the bullet and it has to be now.

Most of the government ministers involved in this decision are parents who have children who are going to be facing the consequences of our weakness.

Please show leadership amongst nations and commit to at least a 50% deduction by 2020.

Yours sincerely

Maria Stratford

The Government's climate policy is pathetic - a 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We need urgent action, not just talk.

Where is the substantial investment in renewables? Australia is ideal for solar energy development - why is this being lost overseas? Where are the incentives for renewable energy development?

I don't want my tax-payer funds being used to enable big business to spew out more emissions. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good.

Kevin, Penny and Peter I urge you to get out of bed with big business and work for ALL Australians.

Sincerely,

Lachlan Coles.

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).

For the next generations' sake, we must act before it is too late.

Michael Frazzetto

I voted for Labor in the last Federal Election for one reason - to dramatically reverse the Howard government's position on climate change.

To date I have been bitterly disappointed that the Rudd Government's action has been mere lip service to the rhetoric used in its election campaign.

In my opinion the Government's 5 - 15% target is grossly inadequate given (i) the scientific data and (ii) the position taken recently by the US administration.

The proposed scheme needs two tiers - one for business and one for households. I do not want the electricity generated by the solar panels on my roof reducing the emissions made by business polluters.

Polluters should not be compensated so they can continue business as usual. They should either be forced into reducing their emissions or to go out of business. Dramatic change is inevitable and Government must get tough to force it to happen. Closure of coal mines and coal power stations will be offset initially by the creation of new gas fired power stations and all kinds of new businesses that will spin off from a movement towards a sustainable low carbon economy.

Coal capture and storage technology is being abandoned all over the world. Please stop wasting my taxes supporting the coal industry. I want you people to be actively encouraging a transition away from coal to gas initially, and then to renewable and no-carbon energy sources such as geothermal.

Your stimulus infrastructure spending should not be wasted on expanding coal export facilities - it should be used to upgrade and prepare the country's electricity network for the replacement of coal with low and no carbon energy sources.

Please get serious on climate change and stop pandering to the bleating voices of self interest.

David Scott

There IS NO CHOICE but to act now for much further reaching greenhouse pollution targets. It has been extremely disappointing to see the Government I helped to vote in being so 'weak in its' policies. so much was promised - so little delivered in this crucial area. You KNOW the scientific stats, you KNOW what is happening: economic recession or not this is the ONLY chance we have to stop the slippery slide to a world that will become increasingly uninhabitable.

What do you suggest I tell my children? That the adults and Government who were meant to be looking after the planet didn't care enough to turn it around? So they will be looking at a planet that can only support human habitation below Melbourne and North of London within a few decades?

COME ON! I implore you to do what you simply MUST.
We must commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Jacquie Sprott

Not just Australia but the whole global community need to make environmental change as high a priority as the financial crisis.

Real changes that make an actual difference; not just platitudes and promises. Look (for example) to Europe where solar panels are in place on the majority of big roof spaces (eg supermarkets) and power can be sold back to the grid at premium rates. If Australia could make it financially effective for business with big roof space to sell power then it would become a priority with minimal government effort/intervention.

Reducing our carbon footprint could include scrapping the desalination plant idea and replace it with a scheme to harness and utilise stormwater. (Again, look to Europe eg Holland for storm water reuse ideas). We have an abundance of water but it flows down the drains (literally) in all of Australia's capital cities.

It's the future of our children at stake so we need to come up with smart solutions.

Sincerely,

Helen Wilson

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.

Setting a robust target with a well thought out scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change outcomes.

Yours sincerely

John McFarlane

All our best scientists are making it clear that the current targets of 5-15% are not nearly good enough, and that this is a problem where the short term 2020 targets are absolutely essential to avoiding devastating runaway climate change. please make future generations proud. be remembered as true leaders not compromising, pushed around, part-of-the-problem politicians. a solution to climate change can also be a positive economic turn around if you as leaders have the strength, courage, and charisma to take us there.

Felix Riebl

Dear Senate Climate Policy Inquiry,

I would like to request that you seek the truth and see past short term political interests and analyse the objective evidence which clearly shows that Global Warming is VERY REAL and might even be happening much more quickly than originally predicted. We could be at the tipping point (OR we might be past it????)

So please:

1. Increase targets significantly (e.g. 50% reduction by 2020).
2. Do anything and everything possible to implement green technologies ASAP (no more mucking around, no more vested interests stalling things, etc)
3. Make sure things are as fair as possible with incentives to encourage "green behaviours" and costs to those who pollute and externalise their harmful activities.

You are there to represent the people and to review the laws and regulations for the lower house SO PLEASE do you your job properly and protect the planet and please GET MOVING. More delays and distractions (e.g. the Global Financial Crisis) will not do anyone any good in the long run.

It really is TIME TO GET REAL!

I would appreciate you being objective when assessing the evidence and doing everything you can to show real leadership in order to address Global Warming.

Yours greenly,

Andrea Beel
BAgrSc(Hons), MAgrSc

To whom it may concern,

I am deeply concerned by the Rudd Government's climate change inaction over the past 12 months. I was expecting so much more from a government that professed to understand the risks associated with dangerous climate change.

The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 are far too weak. We have to lead on this issue and certainly we have a lot at stake including our wellbeing and our nation's iconic places like the Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu. The extreme weather of recent years has shone a spotlight on what kind of future we can expect unless we get serious about deep and meaningful greenhouse pollution reduction targets.

Big polluting companies are getting far too many concessions. Like any industry, if there are not performing to best practice, they don't survive. Many fossil fuel giants have depleted our natural resources for far too long and reaped billions of dollars in the process. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling dangerous climate change.

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 jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy.

I'm in my thirties and I want to have children one day. But I want to show them an Australia that's leading the world in its responsiveness to climate change. I want to take them to my favourite places - resilient forests that provide clean air and water and store carbon. Marine environments brimming with colourful fish and coral, not bleached remnants. I want to take them camping my healthy rivers, not shrivelled up river beds. Please do the Australian public a massive favour for generations to come: make polluting industries accountable for their actions and make our cuts to greenhouse pollution more in the vicinity of 20-25% by 2020. We're all in this together.

Kind regards,

Sarah

The current target of 1-15% is like moving the deckchairs on the Titanic. We need to have stronger commitment to a higher target. At this level it is laughable. It is probably achieved just by changing light bulbs!

It appears that like all governments in the past, you will only take the advice of experts that agree with you and you are willing to put short term approval over making the longer term hard decisions.

Your current scheme for carbon reduction is a really bad system, because it will use the gains made by the good to compensate for the bad polluters.

I have grandchildren and I would like them to live in a world that is better than the one that I live in. Your actions will ensure that that will not be the case. We do not have too long to change this before it is irreparable and something has to be done now.

The only upside for your current targets is that a future Titanic would not sink, because all the icebergs will not exist once the sea ice has melted!

Terry Pinnell

Dear Sir / Madam

The time for action has come - we can no longer accept your watered down and insufficient targets.

Your 5-15% target is hideously insufficient. We need to show leadership and not bow to petroleum based industry pressures. Please instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Kind regards,

Nicholas Bernhardt

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As an average Australian it is understood that climate change has been happening at all times since the world was created. But it is quite clear that today, mankind is causing the climate changes to be happening in a way that has not been caused before to be a manmade crisis today.

These changes are being seen to be effective in Australia so that the Australian Federal Government has the responsibility for effectively leading the world in our actions and activities that scientists are identifying rather regrettably only as they can see the problem through their expertise. In the Senate you must see it generally so that we all can play our part.

As our representatives, us common people who can and want to play our part in assuring that the changes may be minimised through general and effective methods, call on you to represent our requirements for the whole procedure be undertaken to not only do the job but influence the world to realise their responsibilities and abilities to do as we can do; so that the whole world is joining us just as the G20 has effectively caused the whole world to be capable of correcting the mistakes of a few that caused the economic crisis to affect the world today too.

The economic crisis and it's worldwide efforts were triggered by the USA. Let Australia trigger the worldwide efforts with respect to the Environmentally important Climatic change efforts for the sake of future generations of animals, plants and the humans who are the responsible bodies in this case.

It is up to you in the Senate to make it to happen as it has to happen with all of us playing our part in showing the world that it can be done. The doing must not be put off for other times. A crisis just like our Bush fires waiteth for no man and look at the results of those and the floods and now the earthquakes too regrettably.

--

Kind regards,

Tim B. Cox.
Involvement Volunteers Association Inc.,

Dear Minister,

I am happy that the Government has made a commitment to an Emissions trading scheme. I have two main concerns:

1. I would like to see a higher overall target which we set for ourselves, a minimum of 20% but a commitment to equal the highest target set by any country up to 50%.
2. I don't fully understand the detail, but am quite disturbed to think that the solar panels I have contracted to mount on our roof will go to offset coal mining emissions. I strongly support the mining industry being required to cut its emissions by at least 5% in the first year with gradual increases annually until it reaches the target levels set for Australia as a whole.

The unemployment associated with the cut in mining could be offset by encouraging investment in solar, geo-thermal and wind sourced power.

Frank Purcell
ALP member

Hi,

The Carbon pollution reduction scheme (CPRS) needs to achieve a target recommended by scientist's not business. That is 50-60% real reduction (not offset) in greenhouse pollution from 1990 levels achieved by 2020. The scientific community is producing more and more evidence that climate change is happening faster and sooner than expected so this is a requirement not a desire.

A high target sends a clear message to the international community that Australia is prepared to make the tough decisions and give no reason for other countries not to do the same.

The government must not compensate polluters but instead give them an incentive to not pollute any more. This is the best possible time to introduce a strong target and reinvent our economy with a heavy focus on renewable energy, public transport and ensuring we prosper into the future.

Finally the CPRS must also focus on ensuring that individuals and small businesses are given incentives to reduce their greenhouse emissions.

Thankyou for your time,

Elton

I am convinced the govt's greenhouse pollution target will not meet its aims. I am convinced the govt's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will not meet its aims. I am convinced the govt is not on a right path to address the climate concerns it shared with Australia during its election campaigning.

Please. Please. Please. As the alternative voices in parliament do your best to see the bar set much higher for all of us.

Just as our communities come together in a bush fire or a flood, so to, we will come together to achieve deep cuts to our country's emissions.

There will always be opposing voices. Weigh up those opposing voices for any profit motives or loss of profit motives. If the issue of international competition is always going to be a sticking point then - as our leaders - come up with a solution to this issue! If that means import tariffs, so be it. If you can not swallow that then lead us to a better alternative!

Lead us! Allow us to make a difference for our futures.

Regards
Tim Farrelly

Dear Senator,

It's long past time when we've all agreed on the need for climate change policy - I'm asking you now to make sure that Australia's targets for greenhouse gas pollution are much stronger than the current 5-15% proposed by the government. While strong cuts (ie 50% by 2020) will be necessarily tough, I believe recent campaigns such as water saving and recycling have shown that Australians are willing to wear a little discomfort or change in routine in exchange for clearly stated (and globally wished-for) environmental goals. Please - this is something that we literally cannot overreact to. Please consider raising cuts to 50% by 2020.

Yours,
Jo Walker

I am deeply ashamed to be represented by a government that has backtracked shamelessly on the emissions target that we were promised at the last election. Despite all the scientific evidence the Australian government is still in trall to the big energy companies, our targets are tragic and what help will they be in the coming decades when we have failed to provide our children and grandchildren with a decent future. It would have been a much better idea to have invested in good, sustainable projects as a means of overcoming job losses in the current financial crisis rather than giving people money to spend on yet more, unnecessary goods.

Time now, before Copenhagen, to relook at your scheme, so that each person, each business and corporation can believe they can contribute in a real and meaningful way to reducing our emission and the world can see that we are taking a genuine leadership role.

Please act now.

Sincerely

Carey Lai

To whom it may concern,

I'm very upset at the low level of greenhouse gas reduction targets proposed by the federal government. Firstly, it disgusts me that any efforts that I make to reduce my personal carbon footprint only give industry and other individuals more room to pollute, and that polluters are being overcompensated for the few changes they will need to make.

I also feel that Australia is in a position to lead the world, or at least the Asia-Pacific region, in emissions reductions. As a developed nation and a significant exporter of coal, we have an obligation to the rest of the world.

Climate change is happening, and faster than expected. We need to act, quickly. 50% reduction on 1990 levels is what we should be aiming for.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Raymond

Dear Prime Minister Rudd & Senator Wong,

I believe Australia's Carbon Emissions Targets need to be far stronger than the maximum 15% target indicated so far. If USA is discussing an over 80% emissions reduction target by 2050, we need to follow that committed example and at least commit to a 50% reduction of 1990 carbon levels, by 2020.

Australians are willing to adjust their lives to meet the demands of a more sustainable society, but pollution creating industries need to be led by Government policy, and must start modifying their practice as soon as possible.

Please don't make the CPRS redundant by overcompensating the polluting industries, which are the ones that MUST reduce their emissions immediately.

Yours Sincerely,
Thea Katauskas

Thank you for the opportunity to have my point of view heard.

I'm dis-pleased with the weak targets set by the current Federal Labour Government and the way the CPR scheme is structured (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). This is another missed chance for Australian to be seen as innovative world leaders but instead we will be seen as fat lazy westerns who would rather open cut large hole in the ground and burn fossil fuels like there's no tomorrow(at this rate there wont be a tomorrow) then apply ourselves to come up with new innovations and technology that could help create jobs and different industries.

Not only do we need to drastically reduce our need for fossil fuels (5-15% is lame, its like trying to fix the titanic with duct tape just after MacGyver took the rescue boat), we really need to prepare for climate change as it is here now and if we dont put in measures to deal with the ongoing effects of climate change its going to cost more then a few mineral sector jobs, it going to cost us the Earth

This Rudd Government has done a few good things but overall I think our grandkids will refer to this era as the Dudd chapter in Australian political history.

Regards

E Bravington.

I voted for the Labor government for a number of reasons one being your going ahead with global climate change, but from what I can see the Labor government is reneging.

I appreciate the fact that we are in a Global financial crisis, but I feel that if we don't do something now then in a few years it won't matter what state the financial world the world as we know it will be beyond saving.

Regards

Maureen Marsh

Dear Ministers

The current target of 5-15% is totally inadequate to stop life threatening climate change. As an economically wealthy country we should be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse emissions by at least 50 percent by 2020.

The melting of the sea ice in the Arctic is an example of how climate change is occurring at an alarming rate much faster than scientific findings previously thought.

Australia's weak target is undermining global efforts to form crucial international agreement about reducing CO2 emissions. We must improve our efforts before the UN Conference on Climate Change scheduled for December this year.

We should not be overcompensating polluters at the expense of the community and our environment the CPRS is badly designed and does more harm than good.

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

Industry should not be allowed to increase their emissions under the CPRS cap. As they are the largest contributors to our emissions they should be taking the lead to reduce our carbon footprints and make our world a safe and wonderful place to live in.

Yours sincerely

Debbie Claridge

After Garnaut's report I hoped we had the foundation for a response to Climate Change that would be effective in reducing emissions through various mechanisms. The CPRS target is woefully low, there is insufficient incentive for renewable industries - which have huge potential to assist developing countries as well, and the major polluters are treated far too leniently. Also I have installed my own PVs, and I'm sure many more will, but I do resent the possibility that this would let others dodge their responsibility. The power of the many is great but the framework has to be there - the CPRS does not utilise this potential.

Jan Star

Dear Chairman,

I have been attending many of the lectures on aspects of Climate Change arranged by Adelaide University. The variety of expertise among the presenters is considerable. The data presented by the likes of Prof Barry Brook is convincing and frightening.

The melting of the Greenland Ice-cap and the more recent news of the calving-off of a huge chunk from Antarctica mean that the forecasts were, if anything, too "cautious", and that the situation is much more alarming than that predicted by the UN Climate group even a few months ago.

I urge members of the Senate to knock back the mere 5% that is on the Government's agenda and to recommend at least 20% reduction by 2020. If we don't, we shall have reached the tipping-point from where it will be nigh impossible to recover.

Australia has been an international leader in some spheres : having been one of the most guilty emitters for many decades, it is incumbent on us to give a lead in the recovery process.

Yours Sincerely,

Peter Faulkner (UNAA sa)

You pledged to make a serious committment to reducing greenhouse pollution by 2020. Your 5-15% target is pathetic! I would not have cast my vote to help put you into office had I known you'd chicken out on your promise so readily.

Once bitten; twice shy!

Liz Hatcliffe

Dear sir/madam,

I am very concerned about the direction our government is taking on climate change. This is the greatest problem humanity is facing, and we need to act much more radically on this. The set target of 5-15% is simply inadequate. Instead, we need to be planning to cut greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Before the UN conference on Climate change takes place in Copenhagen, I urge members of the Senate inquiry and legislating team to resist the inadequate measure of the government on this issue. When confronted by the prospect of the arctic summer sea ice melting entirely within five years, which science corroborates, we cannot deny the need to take rapid preventative measure.

We need to set a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure Australia does its fair share to forestal extreme climate change. This will also benefit us, as we take advantage of growth industries in renewable energy.

An extra reason why this change has to come from government, not from individuals, is because there is no incentive under the CPRS for small businesses to reduce their targets beyond the weak 5-15%.

As an Australian citizen, I urge you to act seriously on this issue by increasing our reduction target to 50% by 2020.

Sincerely,

Mary Trabucco

Dear Prime Minister, and Senator Wong,

I am sure you do not need to hear from me about the requirement for a more stringent policy re offsetting the destructive effects of climate change. I live in south-west Victoria where our rainfall is disappearing and fires in summer are increasing, and it is clearly not merely freakish weather. South-eastern Australia will be amongst the first to be hard-hit by climate change, according to James Lovelock and others.

I am old now and may well be dead once life here in this still beautiful place becomes ugly and desperate. But I know that we should never let this happen to us.

It is my hope that if other stronger countries such as the US and China raise the level of proposed action on climate change, we will then be able to do so too, and that we would not instead continue to follow a weak and largely futile path for our part. I can see that this is not something that can be stated publicly, but I hope that it is in your hearts. However, I discern that you sincerely intend to succeed in your endeavours, and I wish you and your successors all the good fortune possible in your effort to do so.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Besemeres

The proposed government CRS is unacceptable. It will lock us out of the deep carbon cuts we need to avoid dangerous climate change. Also the proposed new solar power regs are unacceptable giving elec credit instead of 60c per KW back into grid and no eligibility to systems over 3.2KW. This is just protecting the elec companyies and will do nothing to fuel uptake in solar or reduce power consumption.

leon

To Whom it may Concern,

I was very disappointed by the announcement of such low targets for greenhouse gas emissions reduction. I had expected much much more from the government I helped to elect on the promise of strong action on climate change (among other things).

By the rhetoric we heard, Australia was supposed to be leading the way on climate change internationally, but instead is now lagging behind. Communities and families are showing stronger leadership on this than government at the moment and should be supported not sacrificed.

What better time to develop a green economy with renewable energy industries, improved public transport and an integrated system of separate cycleways (did you know that bicycle sales are going through the roof despite the economic downturn?)

Each individual Australian voter put this government in power to represent our interests and those of future generations. Big business doesn't get a vote so don't let them guide your actions.

Regards,
Linda Marr

The 5 - 15% target is a weak response to a problem that could actually render the planet uninhabitable. Greenhouse gas emissions are a real problem and need to be taken seriously. It is more important than a new car, an LCD screen TV, It is more important than Jobs and industry. There really are no jobs on a dead planet and I would gladly sacrifice all the trappings of our modern life if it means that I would be able to breathe clean air, eat good food, not be subject to extreme weather events, and whatever other mysteries lie ahead if we keep changing the atmosphere, aquaphere and surface of 'our' Planet.

The CPRS panders to industries and polluters giving licence for more emissions to be released as they are saved elsewhere. While individuals sacrifice comfort, convenience and Money to save water and energy as they are 'told' the larger polluting industries (with the REAL power to make changes that will have a substantial effect on the global greenhouse problem) will be able to release more greenhouse gasses which will offset the savings made by others.

Get Real. Set realistic targets not easy ones.

Jack Dan

New scientific findings are making it clear that climate change is happening much quicker than previously predicted(melting of the Arctic sea ice)
Australia's target for reducing greenhouse emissions must be strengthened before the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in December(20% at least - or preferably 50% on 1990 levels)
The carbon reduction Scheme must be revised so as to reward domestic conservers instead of over-compensating heavy industrial polluters.
We are involved in an eleventh hour bid to save the planet from destruction by human activity and half-hearted measures won't be enough.
Our grandchildren don't deserve such a harsh inheritance.

Please tackle this issue with conviction.

Margaret and George Ray

so long as we have a roof over our heads and food in our bellies the next most important issue is the enviromemt at all costs.
give us the choice to use our super annuation innvestment on the great
australian dream "OUR OWN HOUSE" instead of high carbon producing projects
decided on by others

regards john nolan

Shame Australia Shame. Five per cent is a sham target. Let's try harder.

Elizabeth Johnston

Hello,

Climate change will affect us all deeply. For this reason we need to act decisively. It will mean changing the way we live and how we do business. If we act quickly enough it may not mean changing where we live, or deprive us of the kind of lifestyle we want.

Innovation is the key. Innovation will be driven however by an even playing field that drives investment in new technologies, better ways of doing things and less resource consumptive measures.

Innovation is driven in part by regulation. A tough stance on carbon emissions will form a significant component of this approach. Weak targets will ensure that Australia lags and does not lead the world into new business opportunities in the development of technological and behavioural responses to climate change.

I urge you to reconsider significant (50% on 1990) reductions in carbon emissions to help foster innovation. This is more important than ever as the decisions made now will help lead Australia out of recession as we join the forefront of a global response to this global problem.

Kind regards,
David Bremner

The government accepts the science and by implication the need for significant reduction in emissions. The report by Garnaut also confirms this. The fact that the evidence that climate change is happening as fast or faster than the IPCC worst case projections and the impacts of these changes also appears to have been underestimated means that the need for, and the urgency of those reductions is greater.

It is incongruous of the government therefore, to appear to accept this but set targets that are well below the 25 -40% targets recommended, and to introduce a scheme that effectively sets a floor as well as a ceiling to emission, and undermines any action taken by individuals or community groups by allowing those savings to be passed on to polluters.

Worst of all, we know that underdeveloped and poorer countries are only going to make changes if we show the initiative and set meaningful targets. The scheme in its current form is likely to result in many countries not committing to any target.

We should be aiming for rapid and significant reductions in emissions, 40% by 2020, and over 90% by 2050. We should be supporting our renewable energy sector and avoid subsidising the fossil fuel industry.

We need to act now. The time for rhetoric is over.

George Crisp

dear government,

we have only one planet which is dying. without it noone is going to survive, maybe apart from some lucky individuals who will be able to escape to the moon. it is of utmost importance that we do our best (and I mean the best!) trying to save our planet before its too late. thank you.

kind regards,
Patrick

I do think the proposed 5-15% by 2020 reduction target is inadequate. This reduction target should much more robust.

Our climate change is agravated by our release of stored energy (coal, geothermal, gas). We should also reduce our overall energy consumption where that energy is released, stored energy as opposed to intercepted (solar, wind, wave)

Industries, agriculture, military, aviation, domestic and commercial operations can change. The shareholders always take a gamble with their investments, when returns are good, and challenging. Job losses are no real excuse for "business as usual" when that "business" is probably going to kill our children or grandchildren.

Regards
Greg

I would like to add my voice to those of the great number of Australians who are extremely unhappy with the Rudd government's climate change actions and policies. I want to see the government making Australia a leader among countries, not an embarrassing impediment to progress! Please make the required changes that would take Australia to such a position; in particular, joining European countries in setting a very strong 2020 target. 5~15% is laughable and a mockery of the action that is required.

regards
Kris Jacques

To whom it may concern,

As one of the millions of Australians who has been disappointed by the current government's shifting stance on climate change, I would urge you to reexamine and strengthen Australia's policies with regard to greenhouse gasses.

A 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gasses is far too short-sighted, and will not serve our interests in the long term. A more ambitious target (eg. 50% by 2020) will allow us to lead by example, helping to influence the international community. This is our best hope of reducing the impact that climate change is already beginning to have on the planet.

At the core of any policy should be measures to ensure that industry is forced to take on the challenge of reducing their emissions. The current CPRS policy does the opposite of this, leaving opportunities for industry to increase emissions. I feel that it's essential that policy is reversed.

While this may make business more difficult for some industries, I would urge to remember that the economic costs of doing nothing are far more disastrous. It is the responsibility of the various businesses and industries to find ways to turn a profit, if the changing world makes it difficult for them to do so, then they must learn to adapt, rather than lobby for the right to continue to work against the planet's best interests.

In closing, I would urge you once again, to consider this issue with regard to the long-term costs not just to Australia, but the entire world.

Thanks for reading.

Sincerely,
Felix Pels

How many millions of Australians will have to be homeless as a result of rising sea levels for you short sighted, money grabbing politicians to see that the time to act is NOW?! The resources available on this planet must be shared by ALL living things on this planet including the air that we ALL breath.

Short term profits for a very small number of people ALWAYS result in very long term loses for a very large number of people.

Stop thinking with your wallet and start thinking "people before profit".

What it will cost today is NOTHING compared to what it is going to cost if we do nothing, or in the case of Australia today, just NOT ENOUGH.

Yours Sincerely

Bob Steele

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my deep concerns with the Federal Governments proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS). I believe the proposed scheme to be far too conservative in its proposed reduction of Australia's carbon emissions: the 5 to 15% target range is far less than the strong action that the government promised it would deliver during its 2007 election campaign, and fails the Australian people on many counts:

Firstly, the Australian people have clearly and repeatedly asked their Government for strong action on climate change. This issue was the primary issue for me at the last federal election, and I know I was not alone in that. A weak target betrays those people who supported the election of the government.

Secondly, a weak emissions reduction target puts both Australia and the world at large in danger of severe or catastrophic levels of climate change. Arguments that Australia's impact on the globe is negligible are irresponsible and nonsensical: in the first place we should take it upon ourselves to provide leadership if the rest of the world is lagging. In any case, others failing to live up to their responsibilities is no excuse not to live up to ours. Arguments regarding the apparent 'uncertainty' of a man made impact on the climate are increasingly ridiculous in the face of mounting evidence, and whatever the uncertainties, surely the potential consequences of climate change warrant taking the chance that the IPCC is correct.

Finally, the economic consequences of action are well within our means as a nation. Australia should in fact be ideally placed to be a low carbon nation, with abundant resources of solar and geothermal energy, access to nuclear materials and a well advanced intellectual base to move forward with updating our stationary energy sources. Our current usage patterns of energy tend to be quite to highly inefficient, leaving a great amount of room for gains by improving energy efficiency. Certainly we face challenges in establishing these industries and solutions, but with government support many barriers would melt away, and grant us the opportunity to provide leadership (and sell our knowledge to other countries).

The combination of these factors would appear to make a strong emissions reduction target a no-brainer decision for the Federal government, and I am highly disappointed that such a weak target has been announced. I hope that we can do better!

Sincerely,
Geordie Mitchell.

The greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets set by the government are not only a great disappointment but also a demonstration of the Rudd Government's inability to recognise and act appropriately on the true cost and risks associated with climate change. Australia has the opportunity to take a stand and become a leader in climate change action and innovation, however the less than adequate targets that the government currently plan to aim for, fall well short of this. A target of 50% reductions on 1990 levels by 2020 would help steer Australia and the rest of the world on the path to avoiding catastrophic climate change.

Scientists (the real experts in climate change) all over the world suggest reductions in greenhouse gases much more than what Australia have committed to will be required to avoid dangerous and irreversible climate change. The effects of which we are already beginning to witness, both here in Australia and abroad.

Not only are our country's targets embarrassingly inadequate, so too is the design of the CPRS. Imposing a floor on Australian emissions destroys the value behind any efforts that State and local governments, companies not directly affected by the scheme, households or individuals may wish to make to reduce their own impacts or those of Australia. Efforts by these groups and individuals must be recognised in the CPRS. This will enable all Australians to work together to avoid the impacts and implications of climate change which, if we do not act upon now, and to the level required will be nothing short of truly devastating and catastrophic.

The question remains... who is the government truly representing? It would appear that they are not representing the Australian public but instead only those companies that have been the cause for our climate crisis. This is not right, and must be changed before it's too late.

There is no doubt that this is the biggest issue that mankind has ever had to deal with and there is still time to set this right and do our bit to avoid this global problem. However time is fast running out.

Luke Wynne

Not only are the current carbon reduction targets insufficient to prevent serious environmental, cultural, and economic effects, I propose that the suggested means of achieving these, or any other targets, are basically flawed. Logically, to reduce carbon emissions, we need to reduce energy consumption. Rather than charging a Carbon Tax, which will have the overall effect of costing everybody money for the use of inefficient energy, surely both the economy and the greenhouse emissions would be better served by investing in more efficient energy production and expenditure.

We already have the technology to implement many of these improved energy schemes. The investors of these schemes must, overall, end up being profitable, and at the same time, be able to reduce energy costs for both industry and the community. All it needs is some clever planning.

Some examples for general energy production include Tidal, Solar, Wind & Hot Rocks. Australia has excessive resources available to be able to develop all of these alternative energy production methods.

Also, the technology for producing more energy efficient machinery is improving constantly. By investing in these latest technologies, the government could drastically improve both industrial and urban efficiency, not only in energy usage, but in their overall infrastructure.

My big question is, why is using less energy costing us more money, when logically it should be costing us less? We have the technology to both produce sufficient clean, renewable energy for less money, and also to use less of the produced energy to achieve our requirement.

Michael O'Neill

The Government's 5-15% target is totally inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

New scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought by the IPCC. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years and the Antarctic is melting much faster than expected as is indicated by the collapsing of the ice bridge that linked islands with the Wilkins Ice Shelf.

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 the 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.

I strongly suggest that you reconsider the terms of the CPRS.

Annie Nielsen

When will the elected representatives of this country stand up and stop mortgaging our futures by supporting unsustainable consumption and greed. The only reason I, and I suspect many others, voted for the current government was their proactive stance on climate change. The low target is an affront to all with any concern for our future and almost non incentive for private investment in energy efficiency, renewable energy and carbon pollution reduction. Surely the current economic woes prove that to build a future based on selling finite resources in an open market is unsustainable. Please take the initiative now to set a benchmark for carbon reduction that others will be forced to follow, promote and support renewable energy systems and make plans now to soften the blow that will be upon us all too quickly.

marcus Glynn

I am not satisfied with the Rudd Government's target greenhouse pollution targets. They are not strong enough to be seen as serious, sending the wrong message to Australian people, business or industry, and does not encourage everyone to become involved in greenhouse gas reduction.

I believe that there is one technology that is reasonably simple to achieve, affordable, and would make a significant contribution. I suggest that coal fired electricity power stations could be converted to using natural gas as a fuel. There would be no changes necessary to distribution networks, the physical locations can continue to operate, and would utilise a resource that Australia has huge reserves. The CO₂ production from burning natural gas would be significantly reduced. I see this as an interim measure, allowing time to develop renewable technologies to become viable, and enabling a controlled infrastructure development to replace existing power stations as they reach their economic end of life.

My suggestion utilises existing infrastructure to be upgraded and modernised as alternate power sources are introduced, eventually making way for the transition away from fire powered power generation.

Thankyou for the opportunity to submit my proposal to your enquiry.

Harry Morris

There is now overwhelming evidence that we have reached a crucial moment for decisions that will affect the welfare of not just Australians but the whole of mankind.

If we are going to maintain any hope of managing the global warming phenomenon then action, and strong action must be taken now. The current targets are far too weak and even disallow the contribution that we, the general householders, are already putting into effect.

Please lead by example and make the right decisions even though these will be politically disadvantageous.

If Australia can't lead with good policies what hope can we have that the rest of the world will do better?

Sincerely,
Alan McLaughlin

A stronger commitment needs to be undertaken by the government to reduce Australia's carbon emissions.

Climate change is happening faster than predicted, with worrying signs coming, particularly with the ice shelf which shattered in Antarctica this week.

A clear design of a reduction scheme needs to be developed and stuck to. Take economic conditions into account, but do not make this an excuse to reduce targets. Place more emphasis on developing up-skill programs for a green industry, and properly identify and re-skill workers.

Provide greater grants and more access to funding for individuals and organisation's that are focused on developing green technology and training

I want the Australian parliament to not have a 'follower' mentality and not use the excuse of not taking action because other countries do not currently do anything. It's a stupid way to live and think and I totally disagree with it. If we were smarter, we would put a solid CPRS in place, with greater emphasis and support to workers and employees on developing green technologies.

CPRS is a start, and it should be intelligently designed to ensure that polluters ARE penalised, however, we should also look at ways of reducing emissions in other ways, such as more emphasis on research and development for more efficient energy solutions.

I'm concerned about the time that has been wasted in addressing climate change issues and more needs to be done by the Australian government to address the issue, and to be intelligent about it. That also means calling on the Liberal party when they are being petty nit-pickers.

I also think that there should be a program in place for reforestation in Australia - perhaps by rewarding landowners for regeneration and regrowth (in some way if it's not already being done).

Thanks
Fiona Croswell

I would like to add my voice to the growing number of people in Australia who would like to see a much more ambitious target for emission reduction.

We must not lock ourselves into targets that limit our options in the future and undermine international efforts to form an agreement on this issue.

It is clear from the breakup of the Wilkins Ice Sheet that global warming is here and we need to act to limit its effects.

Damian Ivereigh

It seems to me, an ordinary citizen, that trading carbon emissions is just another way of allowing Australian companies to slide around and out of their obligation to reduce carbon emissions significantly. This is just relying on 'market forces' again - those same market forces that have just put the whole world economy in jeopardy. Businesses, especially today, act only in their short-term interests. So, the obvious solution is to make it in their short-term interests to curb carbon emissions! If the government is really serious about curbing carbon emissions, it will introduce a straight, direct carbon tax, and this I believe it should do.

For your careful consideration,=

Georgie Hall, Perth

Money is an illusion - wake up and take leadership seriously by doing what you know to do for our future.

Alison Gaffney

I believe 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).

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.

What use is it for me to recycle and do my bit to reduce energy emissions - only to have those efforts used to offset an industrial companies emissions?

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.

Yours sincerely
Catriona Tuite

PM. Kevin Rudd's Emission Trading Scheme is the latest trading scam devised to extract money from the great unwashed. These are the poor shareholders, mortgaged mums and dads, small businesses and pensioners. All forced to survive on limited incomes.

ETS traders do not actually produce anything they just trade other people's nasties (pollution). Traders make up a system to measure nasties such as carbon then trade them on to large industrial corporations. Government does nothing to actually solve the pollution problem, instead they prop up the coal industry et al polluters.

ETS comes on the tail of the failed World Trade Organisation. The WTO representatives feed hungry financial journalists with their propaganda in conferences all over the world. Buried in deep footnotes in complex reports, the media, with deadlines, failed to uncover the layers of jargon of true facts behind the rhetoric. Enron is a prime example and should have been a warning sign of what was to come.

Meanwhile short sellers shifted shares around and those on the inside the CEOs, raised their entitlements long before the bubble burst. WTO representatives feasted up for years in conferences all over the world. What did all these conferences achieved?

Take overs of sound businesses by conglomerates. Privatisation of essential services like power, energy, food and water all over the world became financial burdens to taxpayer as services declined. The privatisation of water and energy are a prime example where many poor people were robbed of their livelihood.

The intelligent vox populi saw through the scam and protested worldwide at every WTO conference. Governments and small shareholders believed in the temporary privatisation boom that offered good short term returns to their shares. "The ladder of opportunity" was good while it lasted but then the snake sent it all down to below where we started before the boom.

Today workers are laid off, superannuation and taxpayers are propping up banks and businesses that have exploited them in the past. CEO's take their leave with their exorbitant payouts. They leave us with AGM reports that ensure the real story is buried in reams of footnotes that overwhelm any reader. This makes it almost impossible to trace the truth of the cause of this worldwide recession. Still the WTO won't die even though it is on life support.

What do we get in return? A government handout for a few that would be better invested in long term services and infrastructures that have been neglected by greedy businesses, bank and pathetic governments for decades. The G20 conference outcome was loaded with rhetoric but little concrete direct action.

I fear for the next generation. How long will it take them to climb the ladder of opportunity again?

Mary Jenkins

I am deeply sceptical that aiming for a 5% reduction of carbon pollution will have the slightest bit of tangible effect in reducing global warming. If we are going to take this issue seriously we need to be doing our utmost to pressure the rest of the world to follow suit. Providing such a meagre reduction is not the strategy to achieve anything.

i am also deeply sceptical about burying such huge volumes of carbon emissions. Surely money would be better spent fast tracking geothermal power that can provide baseload volumes of energy.

Now that it is clear that the USA is taking this issue seriously, it would be a great time to help offset the world wide recession by investing in renewable energy infrastructure.

Sincerely

Antony Partos

I am writing because I feel the government's 5-15% target requiring climate change falls drastically short. 5% is in fact totally pathetic! Please reconsider and take a proactive approach to this important issue. This weak stance is undermining the international effort to improve carbon reduction figures. We are a very fortunate country and we should be taking a leadership role and setting strong targets. The CPRS is poorly designed and needs to be reconsidered. Thank you for considering this issue and I hope you can do more to make a positive difference.

Sincerely,

Dr Delene Weber

To whom it may concern....

The proposed Australian target of reducing greenhouse pollution is far too low. 15% WILL NOT AVERT CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE. Australia needs to committ to reducing our green house pollution by 50% of 1990 levels by year 2020.

If we dont, the rest of the world is unlikely to committ to worthwhile, meaningful targets and the world will get hotter faster with all the consequent problems.

The world may have already reached tipping point as shown by increased ocean heat, thawing of permafrost and loss of some arctic and antarctic ice shelves.

The CPRS scheme currently proposed by Government is a badly designed scheme. It over compensates polluters and provides NO MONEY FOR RENEWABLE sources of energy.

It also provides a gaping loophole in that polluters can buy cheap credits overseas from countries prepared to committ to not cutting down forests - so Australian polluters can get away with not making any changes to pollution output in Australia. Australian CPRS MUST EXCLUDE PURCHASE OF OVERSEAS NON_DEFORESTATION CREDITS!

The CPRS scheme measures pollution and its proposed reduction across both industry and individuals thus if invididuals reduce pollution, industry will not need to reduce their pollution as much. I suggest that the 50% target SHOUL BE AGAINST INDUSTRY & ENERGY SUPPLIERS only TO DRIVE CHANGE IN POLLUTION! Naturally, the government would monitor total pullution and its reduction to report to the world !

The issue of climate change is one in which we must take meaningful action. We face a danger greater than any world war, economic meltdown or even a nuclear catastrophe!!!

Yours Faithfully

Mary Edwards

To Whom it may concern,

The Government's target for Greenhouse reduction is quite unrealistic. I urge our Government to take a closer look at the consequences of its lack of interest in making a worthwhile effort to save our planet. This is extremely urgent and we cannot afford to leave the responsibility to other countries. Time is running out and the children of this world will suffer for the selfishness of this generation. Sometimes I feel totally ashamed to be Australian when I really love my Country. Please take a generous stand before it's too late.

Sincerely,

Maria

Dear Senate

We the voters of Australia elected a new govt with a mandate to save our planet from disastrous climate change. I am deeply disappointed and feel betrayed by the appallingly weak target set. I am prepared to pay whatever it takes, shared out equally, to save our planet for human habitation. Scientists say we need a target of 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). I beg you to find the courage and integrity, as well as the vision, to make this our Australian target.

Sincerely

Martha Morrow

I urge you to set a much stronger target to reduce greenhouse pollution. The proposed target is not good enough. I realise it is difficult to please everyone, but the planet must come first in this matter. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme seems to have a number of flaws. Be courages and make a decision that will benefit all both in the short and long term.

Yours sincerely,

Lee Carmody

Dear Sir/Madam,

I was so shocked and depressed to hear the news last night that the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. This is so devastating and even though the previous government was aware of climate change and its damaging effects, and did nothing whatsoever, it is now up to the current Rudd Government to commit to a climate change policy target of 50% by 2020.

The Government's 5-15% target is not adequate at all to avoid dangerous climate change.

Kind regards

Eula Black

Thank you all for your efforts in tackling Climate Change. Please do your best to remove the politics from the process: this issue affects not only your constituents and fellow countrymen, but every being on the planet. Please look hard and find the best solutions you can for all our sakes.

Now more than ever, we need strong, informed leadership. Be honest, keep us informed and don't be afraid to take drastic action where needed.

Please look at the big picture and the long term consequences of our actions or inaction. Consider the state of the nation and planet and ensure that decisions aren't being influenced by big business. We need to change the whole way we expect to live if we have any chance of making the changes required. I believe the general population will be willing to do this if they can trust their leaders at their word.

Thanks and best wishes to you all.

Cindy Budai

Hi,

I would like to add my voice to that of thousands of Australians who voted for Kevin Rudd expecting strong climate action. The Government's target of 5-15% is not adequate. We the people WANT to make changes - the Government has to support us and educate us on how to do this, while looking for new ways to reduce the emissions from Australia's biggest contributors to carbon.

Kind regards

Katy

The 5 - 15% reduction of greenhouse emissions target the government has set us is insultingly small. Most of the population of Australia is worried by climate change. We see the ice caps melting, we see the disappearance of species from their normal habitats, we see the drying out of whole states of Australia, and increased danger from "natural" disasters like fires and storms. I think most of us are aware of alternatives to the way we are living and consuming resources and particularly energy, now. But we need government to coordinate the actions we are willing to take, and to make fair decisions about any changes we have to make. At present we have 5% better than climate change denial from our leaders. Frustration is growing as the urgency increases.

We are standing in the way of decent international agreements while pretending to be participating. We are also likely to miss out on the opportunities for modernisation and development that renewable energies offer.

The disappointing Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed is not likely to be effective. It will obscure more carbon pollution than it will prevent. A carbon tax would be more straight forward and effective and easier for us all to understand and believe in. It is infuriating that under the CPRS our improvements as citizens will be nothing but a license for big industry polluters to increase emissions.

We demand to be allowed to be part of the solution rather than being forced to continue worsening the problem.

Sincerely, Janet Hall

Dear Mr Rudd,

The 5%-15% carbon reduction target is unrealistically low given the scientific reports on climate change.

Australia is well-placed to take a lead on this issue and we must commit to a target nearer to 50% greenhouse pollution reduction (on 1990 levels).

Regards,

John Edwards
Bennelong

The Rudd GOvernments 5-15% target and the poorly designed CPRS will not stop catastrophic climate change. The effects of climate change will cost many more lives and many more dollars than the effects of acting to stop climate change. The science is unambiguous. Dangerous tipping points have already been reached many years before the predictions. I call on the Government to set a stronger target and implement a scheme that enables all cuts to carbon emmissions to be just that- cuts. The interets of the coal industry must not be given more weight than the need for serious reductions. I cal on the Government to make a genuine switch to renewables. We need to be able to ensure that the planet is livable both in our lifetimes and in 100 years time. The current policy will bare responsibility for widespread mortality across the globe as a result of catastrophc climate change events.

Yours sincerely,
Carol Peterson

The 5-15% reduction target proposed by the government is clearly grossly inadequate. It should be much higher, at least 30%, hopefully even higher. The low target will have little impact on Australia's greenhouse gas output, already among the highest in the world per capita. It subsidises big polluters at the expense of individuals and the environment. It will not give Australia a strong leadership and bargaining position at Copenhagen. As a member of the government's Expert Advisory Group on climate change and biodiversity, I understand the significant detrimental impact global climate change will have on Australia's biodiversity; in fact a greater impact than most other countries.

The CPRS should allow for and encourage individual actions to reduce carbon pollution. The current situation where individuals who reduce their greenhouse gas output only subsidise increased pollution by industry is ridiculous and counter-productive.

Andrew Burbidge

The government's 5% target for reducing greenhouse emissions is way too low if we plan to reduce the damaging impact of greenhouse pollution on our environment. The government's 5% target for reducing greenhouse emissions is fine if we plan to destroy the planet and our capability to live here. Let's rethink the target and do as much as possible to reduce emissions. Individuals, communities and corporations can indeed be regulated into curbing emissions - it just takes a government willing to provide strong leadership.

Go on - do it for the future

Kate Driscoll

Immediately the government announced its WEAK climate change policy I rang the Australian Labor Party to tell them I will never be voting for them again as a result of their betrayal of voters on a crucial policy for the future of our planet.

I find it hard to believe how profoundly stupid the two major political parties have become on the matter of climate policy. Their short-sightedness and over indulgence in short term political game playing is breathtaking.

I have now decided to refer to the two major parties as DUMB and DUMBER and I cannot see them relinquishing these titles in the foreseeable future!!!

For god sake grow up and get REAL about this FUNDAMENTAL issue.

Noel Evans

We are hearing daily from the scientific community that climate change is happening more rapidly than we had thought.

I submit that the target of 5 - 15% reduction in emissions is insufficient. Ross Garnaut recommended that Australia make cuts of 25%. I believe we could do better, and that making cuts of 50% on 1990 levels is achievable and necessary.

We're a smart, quick country. We have the skills and resources to develop a large green collar job sector, manufacturing and developing renewable energy sources. This will have significant benefits for a future sustainable economy.

I am outraged at the current proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme, where any cuts I might make as an individual (such as installing photovoltaic panels) will be considered to balance a businesses continued pollution.

In particular, I want the floor for the CPRS removed. This will hobble our progress enormously and keep some sectors of the community polluting with impunity. We are dooming our atmospheric commons with this aspect of the scheme.

As a nation, we have a responsibility to provide global leadership on this issue. We must develop a better, smarter, greener scheme by the UN conference on Climate Change, to be held in Copenhagen this December.

Regards,

Elvira

We are experiencing the effects of climate change every day - floods, bushfires, ice shelves collapsing. It is becoming increasingly clear that the world needs to reduce greenhouse emissions as a matter of urgency.

I want Australia to commit to stronger greenhouse reduction targets. This issue determined my vote at the last federal election, and I am appalled that close to 2 years later the Rudd government still hasn't done anything about it.

I have made changes in my personal life to reduce my carbon footprint such as giving up my car, using a bicycle, installing solar hot water and planting a vegetable patch in my garden. I also try to persuade all of my friends, colleagues and clients to take similar measures in their own lives. However for effective change to be realised across Australia the government must put in place strong carbon reduction targets.

Please, please, PLEASE set stronger reduction targets.

Thank you and good luck!

Alex Wilson

Dear Senators,

As trustees of the planet, I believe it is our duty to commit to reducing Australia's 1990-level greenhouse pollution by 50% before 2020.

We should implement a strong CPRS that includes all polluters. There should be an incentive for all individuals and small business to take action to reduce energy.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Matthews

In my eyes, the 5% greenhouse reduction plan is slap in the face to the Australian public, and even to others around the world who have stood up for this country in the past.

I would like to be proud of my nations efforts to avoid climate change, not be embarrassed by them.

We should be helping to set the benchmark for climate action and changing the old mindset of let someone else handle it, to a better outlook that to take no action is not acceptable.

For mindsets to change, our government must set the example. If there can be no happy medium between industry and environment, then environment MUST be the priority. It's the right thing to do and for governments to justify turning their back on a serious reduction plan for the sake of looking like the good guys who kept jobs in Australia is ridiculous.

Believe me. If governments continue to refuse to act against climate change then future generations will see you as tyrants and plunderers!

I know I would one day like to explain to my children that action was taken to preserve Earth and Life, and I was around to see it.

Alistair Mclean, 24

It is unacceptable that the Government has committed to such a weak carbon reduction target of 5 - 15%. This target condemns Australia's national icon, the World Heritage Great Barrier Reef, to a certain death. The science has shown that there is no time to wait to reduce pollution if we are to avoid dangerous climate change.

It is the responsibility of the Government to produce a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that will benefit our environment and community and not over-compensate polluters like the current proposed Scheme does.

I strongly urge the Government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). There is no time to wait. The Government should think seriously about the legacy that they will be leaving behind if they do not commit to this level of pollution reduction.

Regards
Jacki Boyce

As noted by the Hon. Peter Garrett, the collapse of the Wilkins Ice Shelf is the most tangible proof to date that global warming is real. We must act now, and everybody - individuals, companies and governments - must be prepared to wear the cost of saving the planet. Perhaps if it was viewed as an insurance policy against far worse, and far more expensive, future outcomes, it would be more understandable to the average person.

Please act soon. Make the targets realistic. Don't give in to big industry!

Megan Kemmis

The Government's weak 5-15% carbon reduction targets are completely unacceptable. Citizens across Australia are continuing to make simple changes to their lifestyle to reduce their personal emissions. Australian's are concerned about our environment, we are doing our little bits but they are trifles if Australia continues to commit to such ridiculous targets. We need real action to save our future. A target closer to 50% by 2020 is the answer.

Kind regards
Marie Smurthwaite

I have great regard & much faith in Kevin Rudd's ability to make big changes - changes that require a lot of courage but where is his courage when the important problem of dealing with climate change has to be faced? You know it is the most important question of our times, so why this timid response, Prime Minister?

What about showing the world that this Government has the boldness to tackle head-on the dangers of a world that is reeling under the burden of senseless pollution.

We need a brave leader to inspire us to find new ways of providing employment without adding to the woes of the planet....Gladys Peck

To Whom it May Concern,

I'm writing to add my voice to the inquiry into the government's climate policy. I completed a natural science degree earlier this century, so have an intimate understanding of the ramifications of climate change and the speed at which it is and can occur to a point that is incredibly damaging to life on this planet.

I believe that the 5-15% target recently mooted by the government is totally inadequate. I voted for the Labour party specifically because they had a strong climate policy. I feel very let down by the weak targets they are talking about. I also feel very embarrassed in global terms. It is our moral and ethical duty to take responsibility for our own actions. Targets of no less than 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels which is what Kyoto was all about) are required.

This issue is of such enormity and urgency that I would have no problem in doing it tougher than I currently am financially if it meant positive change.

I urge you to do what is right rather than what is economically viable. I'd rather my children and I live into the future than be "financially viable".

The time to act is NOW. It was actually 20 years ago, but let's just get on with it and work out how to deal with these things as we go. Humans are incredibly adaptable and intelligent.

Regards
Brett Grimley

I am most unhappy with the government's weak response to imperatives to prevent further climate change. The emissions target for 2020 is ridiculously low if it is to make any impact on the problem. The Europeans and even the Chinese have greater targets than this.

Today's terrible news about the collapse of the ice bridge in Antarctica, with consequent threat to the Wilkinson ice shelf, and the melt now happening so fast in the Arctic are just the most recent examples of the threat.

The CRS announced has real problems. There is far too much compensation to the really big emitters, and the efforts that we are all making in our own small ways domestically will simply not count. Marian Wilkinson's article yesterday about the nonsense of clean coal just reinforces how absolutely crucial it is that we make some really hard decisions about reducing our reliance on coal.

The global financial meltdown and the need for financial stimulus is the perfect opportunity for the government to put some big money into developing the renewables industry - what a fabulous difference a billion dollars would make. Obama is showing the way.

Please Ms Wong and Mr Rudd, think again. There's no loss of face in announcing that things are more urgent than it seemed and therefore you've had a re-think. Please, for all our sakes and those of our grandchildren.

Louise Fenley

I write to express my strong concerns over the targets and processes proposed for the CPRS.

It is clear from the scientific evidence that a 5 to 15% reduction target is not enough to prevent dangerous climate change. Now that the G20 has come to some agreement on the GFC, now is time to be strong on the real crisis, which was here before the GFC and will be with us (may even cause) the next GFC.

The scheme must be redesigned to take into account community effort in GHG reductions. Recalculations on the cap must occur annually at least.

It is time to stop talking about % reductions and rubbery base years (is it 1990, 2000 or some other convenient base line that make things look o.k.) and start talking about projected increases in global temperatures in 2050. If the governments of the world had the guts to admit that they are committing to horrendous rises in global temperatures, then we might start getting some action. Percentage changes in CO2 mean nothing to most people.

Dr Graham Moore
Environmental Engineer
University of Melbourne

To whom it may concern,

It is clear that we need strong action on climate change and strong leadership will be required to take such action. We should be moving away from bowing to the interests of industry and focusing on the kind of environments we want to live in and ensuring industry is realigned to meet our community goals. Specifically, I consider that we need:

- a much stronger target wrt reducing greenhouse gas emissions of at least 50% by 2020
- a much more innovative carbon pollution reduction scheme that ensures polluters are not able to continue their current practices
- a policy that ensures Australia is a leader in innovation towards a clean, green world and one that ensures Australia takes its responsibilities in contributing to this seriously

I would like to see all parties in the Australian government working together to ensure we have the best possible solution to climate change possible.

Best wishes
Kate Silburn

I believe the 5%-15% reduction of greenhouse gases as proposed in the Government's CPRS Bill is inadequate. The target should be based on scientific evidence and set at a level that will avoid dangerous climate change. It needs to be AT LEAST 25% of 1990 levels.

I am also particularly concerned that the CPRS will operate as a disincentive to individual action to combat climate change. If individuals who are not covered by the scheme make efforts to reduce their carbon emissions and this frees up permits for big polluters to pollute, what point is there in individual action?

The CPRS needs a stronger target and needs to ensure it does not act as a disincentive to individual action to combat climate change.

Jemilah Hallinan

I'm distressed that our country seems to be satisfied with a 5% cut in emissions by 2020 as a target. It's not nearly enough. We've got to do more and do it quickly.

I'm also very upset that anything I do, anything our friends and neighbours do, anything the ACT Government does, even, won't affect our total emissions. How can you justify a setup where fewer emissions by concerned people are immediately used to justify more emissions by others e.g. industry? There's no incentive at all, just massive discouragement.

Please do all you can to achieve a setup where

- our targets are big enough to make a real difference
- every individual's reduced emissions mean fewer emissions from Australia

The world's children will thank you for it --

Stephen (Hodgkin)

As an engineer with an extensive working knowledge of the global warming issues facing the world I believe it is critical that Australia's proposed Climate Action Targets be substantially increased to at least double their current values (i.e. our minimum target if other countries do not participate should rise from 5% to at least 10% and our upper target of 15% if the rest of the world does participate should rise to at least 30%).

The current economic crisis presents a very good opportunity to begin the task. Stimulus funds could be spent on renewable energy and energy reduction projects and achieve the goals of stimulating the economy, creating employment and reducing greenhouse emissions.

John Osborne

Whilst I specifically voted for your government in the last election on your Environmental Policies; specifically Climate Change and Global Warming, I am yet to see or hear any positive action your government is planning to take on this issue. And whilst both of your Environmental Ministers -Penny Wong and (unfortunately - as he appears to be gagged) Peter Garrett will probably disagree (as appears the policy for Ministers dealing with the general public) I would believe most Australians are getting very fed up with your Governments lack of "Real" action to address Climate Change and your proposal of a 5% to 15% reduction will achieve nothing. The Garneau Report should be taken more seriously and realistically.

However, the only "real" way to have a "Duty of Care" for our future living standards and a quality of life is to put action into place for the construction of really sustainable energy systems; Solar being the most obvious; and geo-thermal Energy. Put in legislation a raft of measures that are time delivery quantifiable. Example: Solar Arrays are to be build to give a minimum of 75% Electrical Energy to all national Capitols by 2020. To remove all domestic vehicles that produce any Carbon emissions from Australian Roads by 2025. And all Commercial vehicles by 2030.

This all sounds all too hard to achieve, but unfortunately the procrastination and the "bowing" to Industry needs - over environmental needs, has past. We can no longer wait. If these measures; and several other major Environmental Issues such as nutritional foods, and clean available water, have not been addressed and solved by 2050 then, in all probability, the indications are that life as we know it will be radically altered; and from our perspective - for the worse. Politicians have the power to limit the effects of future Climate Change. But to what extent only history will show.

Maybe we can only re-live Easter Island.

Andrew Raff

To whom it may concern.

I am concerned about the current inadequate climate change targets. We as individuals are being asked to reduce our individual greenhouse pollution however with a government target of just a 5- 15 % reduction, it seems not everyone is being asked to contribute in an amount that would actually make an impact on climate change. 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 be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

We are aware that climate change is happening faster then 1st anticipated however this despite these scientific findings the Australian Government is proposing a reduction of Greenhouse pollutions that will have little or no effect.

I want a commitment to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollutions by 50% by 2020 so that we have some chance to slow and even stop climate change for our sakes and our childrens sake.

Thank You

Lisa Kamaralli

I strongly agree with all of the points listed on the right-hand side of this page by Get Up.

I couldn't have expressed it better myself, after completing a short course on "The science of climate change" at my local U3A, Nunawading, Victoria.

Hello everyone,

The Government's present climate change policy is grossly inadequate. All the recent research on climate change has shown the the IPCC forecasts are overly conservative. The Arctic sea ice is disappearing rapidly. The Antartic ice shelves are collapsing. Climate change is happening faster than predicted. We can not sit around doing nothing while climate change trashes Australian agriculture, destroys the Great Barrier Reef, and exposes millions more people to diseases like malaria and dengue fever. It is just wrong.

And let's face it. A 5% reduction from the world's number one per capita pollution is pretty much a case of doing nothing. It is embarrassing and shameful.

So what is needed?

1) A real target. 20% minimum. 50% is more realistic. We have to be strong leaders on this so we can persuade the rest of the world to take strong action as well. We have to accept that in the long term the only fair emissions level is the same for every person on the planet. And that means that Australia is looking at more than 90% cuts.

2) More support for the renewable energy industry. This country is packed with solar, wind, wave, geothermal energy waiting to be tapped. We can export energy to the world if take the initiative.

3) Emission trading relies on market forces. The world's economy is present proof that market forces are not necessarily efficient and effective. We can not afford to drop the ball on carbon emissions the way the banks have fumbled debt and risk. A carbon tax is conceptually and administratively simple, and hence quick to implement and harder to rort.

4) The proposed CPRS gives far too much compensation to polluters. The whole idea of emission trading is to make it more expensive to pollute. There is no point then compensating the polluters. It's not like this has come as a surprise, the polluters should have planned for it rather than just try to keep destroying the planet in business as usual.

5) The proposed CPRS scheme is flawed in that it remove the incentive for anyone to take any other action to reduce their emissions. That just makes polluting cheaper for the polluters.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely,
Andrew

I have worked for years as a tour guide and every year we seem to lose more days and income to closed national parks with the rising number of fires. Not to mention the forests lost to increasingly hot fires.

We need to do everything we can to right our wrongs and this time not let greed stop us.

Thanks

Ben Griggs

Hello,

I don't have time to write a lengthy piece on why we need stronger targets.

It is my view, however that we do need stronger targets. I appreciate the position of the government (industry pressure, current economic situation etc) but stronger targets are more important than such considerations.

I have just been retrenched and know that personally I am facing a tough time. For the sake of a safer world for the future, I think tightening our belts is a small price to pay.

Please go through with making the tough choices.

Regards,

Hedda Ransan-Elliott

NOW is the time to ensure that we reduce our carbon emissions ... it is good for future generations AND current business practice and lifestyle changes.
Norelle Feehan

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

Scientific findings show that climate change is happening more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

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 proposed by the Government is badly designed and will do more harm than good. The scheme 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.

Michael Kearney

The weak 5% greenhouse reduction target is unacceptable.

I as an Australian find this abhorrent and demand for this to be rectified as soon as possible.

It will lock us out of the deep carbon cuts we need to avoid dangerous climate change. Worst of all, Australia's weak stance will undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change.

PLEASE RECTIFY THIS SITUATION AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.

Regards

Lara Shanahan

Come on Mr.Rudd, you'd inspired me with signing of that old Kyoto agreement, so where's the follow-up by keeping that good work going?

Cheers, Simon.

ps_ Great work on the new broadband plans for Australia.

To whom it may concern,

When I watched Kevin Rudd in the debates on TV prior to his becoming prime minister, I remember being so excited that we were about to elect a forward-thinking, environmentally conscious man to run this country. So far, I have been nothing but disappointed in his decisions surrounding climate change and the environment as a whole.

The Australia under John Howard was a follower. We were seen as like America and were mocked as weak. Instead of following the rest of the world in the crusade against climate change, how about we lead the rest of the world and gain the respect that we would deserve for taking a stand. 5% is simply not good enough and Australians are intuitive and intelligent enough to acknowledge that not only can more be done, we can do it in innovative, industry-leading means which will eventually create more jobs as well as lessening the country's footprint.

We cannot escape climate change. Many scientists believe that the human race will not survive this century which is not the future I want for my daughter. Please, I beg that you reconsider this pitiful stance.

Regards,

Christian Biggins

The science is in. Business are thinking it is someone else's problem.

We need some moral backbone to reach 50% renewables by 2020

Regards

John

The current target is a surrender to the consensus. Mr Rudd, as one of your constituents (Coorparoo) I implore you to show greater leadership and lead the fight for a reversal of the current climatic situation we find ourselves in.

Kind regards

Graham & Rhonda JURD

To my generally much appreciated government

I am highly disappointed by your recent proposals for action on climate change. I believe that your target of 5-15 % reductions in greenhouse emissions is inadequate. In order to make a truly effective contribution to this cause I feel that that we should be aiming towards a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over the next ten years.

Our currently 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 You is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good as it 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.

The floor of the CPRS beyond which emissions cannot fall, means that the actions of individuals and small businesses taken to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than Your current weak target. This will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Thanks in advance to paying heed to this pressing issue.

Kind regards

Ember

To Whom it Concerns,

Please aim for a much bigger cut in Australia's carbon emissions. Please also make the scheme less complicated with less reward to the large polluters.

Thank,
Regards
Neil Cogavin.

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

John Gelsthorpe

I am in despair over the government's current approach to climate change.

We have only a short window of time in order to make significant changes to carbon emissions & lifestyles, and the government's proposed targets are way too low to achieve the kind of change needed. Additionally, the proposed carbon emissions trading scheme offers disincentives to individuals who are prepared to make changes and to live sustainable lives, & lets big polluters more-or-less completely off the hook. It also gives far too many exemptions.

There is no time for fiddle-faddling. The hard work needs to be done NOW so there is even a chance that people around the world can enjoy a reasonable quality of life in the decades to come.

We need much higher targets. We need schemes which offer incentives to individuals and corporations to go carbon neutral, and we need money invested in R&D for sustainable technologies & the development of green jobs.

We need a building code which mandates at least 6 star environmental sustainability.

The current economic crisis actually offers the perfect opportunity to stimulate the green economy. Please stop handing money out to all & sundry and start investing in sustainable infrastructure and the green economy.

Forget propping up those industries which can't manage to go green - their time is past. It is time now to make the changes that have to be made so that our children and their children have a world to live in. We also need to be mindful of the immense humanitarian problems (& probably wars) which will ensue if drastic action is not taken in the next FIVE years.

Thank you,

Christine Banks

Is there no one out there who is able to make governments understand that urgent action is needed?

Australia - a very rich nation compared to so many others - seems doomed to suffer more and more extreme weather events as well as running out of water and polluting its once flowing rivers.

Please form an overreaching lobby group to petition government and organisations with some leverage so that climate change and Australia's water situation are considered issues of urgency.

(from Anne Findlay, Melbourne)

I have three children; it is NOW that action needs to be taken so that they are provided with a safe and healthy environment in which to live; this is the most important issue facing our country ever! I demand that the Rudd Government, in whom so many of us placed our trust at the last election, take strong, positive action on this issue.

Margaret Jones

I expect leadership from this government, not trying to find a palatable middle ground. The opposition have nothing to offer so the government has a mandate to be brave and take a strong position and make a global example showing our commitment as a nation.

Everybody is taking a conservative position from scientists to politicians. The truth is going to be way worse than we think and our actions therefore need to be targeted and successful. California have taken a bold stand and the whole world knows it. They are leading their nation just as we need to lead our region: by example.

thank you

David

I believe it is essential for the Australian Government to act more strongly to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to avoid irreversible damage to the environment in Australia and other parts of the world.

Although there are associated costs, the recession in fact provides a unique opportunity to do this. First of all, Australians should be encouraged to reduce consumption and thus greenhouse gases.

Secondly, any money spent on stimulating the economy should be spent on infrastructure that will be either carbon neutral (education, for example) or on measures such as improved public transport that will reduce carbon consumption.

yours sincerely

Charlotte Clutterbuck

Dear Mr Rudd and Ms Wong,

Please rethink your greenhouse emissions policy. The policy should be designed so that:

1. Every individual who makes an effort to reduce their carbon emissions can have a real effect on Australia's Carbon Footprint. This means that overall targets do not allow others to emit more if we emit less
2. Big polluters will have an incentive to use technology to clean up their act
3. There are incentives to reduce reliance on fossil fuels
4. There are large incentives to go green, to reduce energy use, to switch to wind, solar and other green forms of energy
5. The community is continually made aware of new green products available and chance to invest in green products, such as the solar 'films' made out of the same type of plastic, and just as cheaply as dollar notes, that can be used to create solar energy (Monash University)
6. People are encouraged to spend more time outdoors and active, connecting with family and friends in low polluting activities such as playing in the park, instead of in front of the television or computer...

I hear the park calling

Christine Storie

Hoping the government will produce policies for a greener, more sustainable and FAIRER future.

Its time to act, not delay. Australia needs to lead and act now. The targets are too small, we need dramatic cuts. How can China and India act at all if we give them so little room to move. They need to make huge cuts and we need larger ones. We cannot expect them not to want a better standard of living for their people so the west needs to cut dramatically and now. Coal is dead, at least under all current and foreseeable technologies, so we need to drop it. Now more coal or gas fired powerstations should be built in Australia (anywhere really) and we should start to replace our current coalfired stations now.

Everyones reduction should count, don't let big polluters get away with it. Any government that allows big polluters to get away with no major reduction of carbon will not be in government long.

Act now, for our children, our planet.

Jeff

Dear Mr Rudd

I am very concerned about the Australian government's target to reduce carbon emissions by 5%. I understand that halting the rollercoaster towards irreversible environmental damage through climate change is expensive and involves a dramatic change in both government and global policy. However, the latest scientific research shows that it is now blatantly obvious that this is what is necessary if we are to avoid irreversible damage to our environment. What is more important at this stage? Playing small? Making tiny, ineffectual steps in the right direction? Keeping the political peace? Or doing what you know is right? Take a stand. Support an international agreement to make a real difference before the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December.

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. Do the right thing.

Yours sincerely

Bridget Ferguson

We need much stronger action against the devastating effects of climate change ... we should reduce our greenhouse pollution 30 - 50% by 2020, otherwise we will have no hope in hell of reversing the situation. There are predictions that we already have passed a crucial point where warming cannot be stopped, but just in case those predictions are wrong, we should take decisive action. What will we tell our children and grandchildren for our failure to act dramatically?

Sincerely,

Mary Lee Beggs

I am very concerned about the minimal targets set for 2020 and the lack of commitment shown to addressing climate change. In particular, I am highly concerned about the CPRS making a situation where the effort of individuals just allows a larger number of carbon credits to be given to polluters.

The spectre of climate change is not new. Large industry has had years to address climate change as an issue. Industries that have not adapted deserve to fail - protectionism that allows them to continue to pollute and gives them a long time to adjust when urgent change needs to occur NOW is unfair to our children. All it requires is commitment from the government to say we will do what needs to be done, NOW.

For example, my family has not run a car for nearly two years, and I have a family of 6, my youngest child being two years old. Everywhere we go, we go by bike, public transport or we walk. A few times a year we hire a car to visit friends and family. We do our grocery shopping with a bicycle trailer. We are installing solar panels and a heat pump hot water service as soon as we are able. We grow our own fruit and vegetables. We have 10000L rainwater storage on our property. These changes are not as difficult as you might imagine, but it significantly reduces our impact on the environment. It makes me despair to think that the effort that we go to might not be that effective because of the policy of the government.

The economic stimulus package, although it does provide rebates for insulation incentive for landlords to improve the efficiency of their housing stock, doesn't go far enough to address climate change. If you were serious about it, the FBT concessions on motor vehicle travel would be removed, the train lines around Australia would be put onto a single gauge, and fast trains would run between all the capital cities. Public transport would be significantly subsidised (or even made free) so that the carbon emissions from transport could be dramatically reduced. There would be legislated changes that require all hot water services sold in Australia to be solar systems or heat pumps. Similarly, it would be a requirement for all electrical appliances to meet a minimum standard of energy efficiency. Refrigerated airconditioning would be banned, and heat pump or evaporative cooling technology would take its place.

Everyday on the way home from work I ride past a sign that says, 'climate change is arson'. I disagree. I think climate change is genocide. We have a moral duty to stop it.

Yours, in despair

Kerri Feigan

I agree with all the points GetUp makes ...but also...

There is so much that needs to be done now and there are people that need jobs now.

We shouldn't be paying polluters to continue polluting. These companies are not stupid and the writing's been on the wall for some time. Times change. Isn't capitalism about successful business surviving, while unviable, harmful businesses go under or transform. It happens all the time. Why waste money on companies that are not going to be needed in the future?

We need to invest in renewable energy industries, legislate to make buildings, companies, individuals reduce emissions to zero over a short period of time, invest in infrastructure for energy efficiency, public transport, sustainable cities, sustainable agricultural practices and so many other things that would help reduce emissions and soak up CO2 from the atmosphere. This massive effort would absorb all the unemployment and create more jobs than we can fill.

Fixing the economy needs us to fix the climate problem or else there will be increasingly larger bills to pay as time and the climate moves on with, or without us. Bills due to decreasing rainfall in the south, increasing floods and cyclones in the north, sea level rises well above the last IPCC report estimates, increasing bushfires, habitat loss (eg. Great Barrier Reef), agricultural productivity decline, health problems (eg. spread to Australia of tropical diseases, heat related deaths).

If we do not move towards sustainability reasonably rapidly, we are basically saying that we don't need a viable future. The social/psychological cost of that attitude as the youth realise what is not being done could be enormous. It is also a very selfish way to run a country. We know what needs to be done. We know how to do it. We can do it. But we won't because we're sort of OK right now and it all just seems too hard! Not a good look now or in retrospect.

Thanks,

Janet Dean

I support the inquiry into the Government's climate change policy and believe that the situation demands much stronger action and soon.

This action should be designed to encourage sound sustainable industry rather than compensate polluters.

I urge the Senate to put aside party politics and examine ways in which Australia can respond to the crisis responsibly.

Louise Dortins

Hey!

We have the most abundant natural resources. Let's set the Australian bar high
- because we can and must!

Invest in the technology; save our planet and reap benefits of being a lead in
the sector.

Thanks for caring.

Sarah

I must add my voice to those who recognise that planned action, ie 5-15% target is NOT enough. Climate change is obvious and moving fast and we need to do more than make a small gesture, allowing industry to increase emissions. Time to get tougher and design a scheme that does not reward community efforts with more pollution by big polluters.

Judy Frazer

To Members of the senate Select Inquiry on Climate Change

I urge you to recommend that the Government's stated target of reducing greenhouse pollution by 5-15% be raised significantly to a level more appropriate to having a real impact on emissions that contribute to global warming.

The current proposal seems to see polluters over-compensated at the expense of the environment and the community.

Please recommend the setting of a target that will see Australia doing its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change and setting an example to the world rather than following the lowest common denominator. Help me feel pride in Australia's stance rather than embarrassment.

Thank you

John Dun

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you out of my concern for the environment, and changing climate. As a citizen of Australia, and a mother.

I believe that the current target set by the Rudd government, of 5-15% cut of greenhouse gas emissions, is dangerously low.

At this rate, we will not be able to slow the warming of our climate.

A new target should be set. A 50% reduction by the year 2020. This sounds like a drastic measure, but think again. Just imagine what is going to happen when the level of our seas rise by 5 metres, displacing millions of people living in coastal regions around the world.

Changes also need to be made to the structure of CPRS. As it stands currently, any reduction made above the low target of 5-15%, by individuals in their own homes, will then permit business' to pollute more. This is unacceptable and unfair, and needs to be amended.

These changes need to be made before December, when the UN meet on Copenhagen for the conference on Climate change.

Australia, as a wealthy first world country, needs to stand up and take responsibility for our share of greenhouse gas emissions.

Kevin Rudd...Are you going to be just another Prime Minister of Australia, under the thumb of big business?

Or will you be remembered as the Prime Minister who stood up for Australian, and took real action on climate change. Making important changes to our societal structure, and important rules for business' in order to preserve the integrity of our environment, for Humans, Animals and all our future generations.

Yours sincerely and hopefully,

Heidi Williams

I believe it is imperative that our government show strong leadership over climate change targets. They need to commit to reducing pollution in proportions that will make a difference. 5 to 15% is not adequate. Climate change is real and is happening fast. We need leadership on a national and international basis and that's why it is important Australia's targets are raised to a more realistically helpful level before the UN conference in December.

Yours sincerely

Alison Haynes

The planet on which we live is not something that we have the right to destroy. It is our duty to use it in a sustainable manner preserving it for the use of future generations.

Sure there are numerous countries that are having a much larger impact such as the likes of China, India and the United States however it is up to us to lead by example and put in place policies to help educate and in many ways force the larger population of Australia into living sustainably. A 5% ~ 15% reduction is a disappointing result from a government that promised so much in terms of climate change reductions.

I implore you to consider the longer term strategic benefits of a larger 40~50% reduction in our carbon outputs and not the potential shorter term financial problems that may be raised.

Regards

Nick Walker

5 per cent is not enough! I am deeply, deeply alarmed by scientific research that shows that climate change is occurring at a much faster rate than previously thought. The future of our planet and of my daughter's future lies in your hands, along with other governments around the world. Please set a stronger target along with a well designed scheme that means that Australian businesses and individuals cannot shirk their direct environmental responsibilities.

Warm regards

Shelley Marshall

To whom it may concern;

I am very concerned that Australia's government would think that a reduction of 5% in greenhouse pollution would be adequate.

I strongly support the move to drastically reduce our carbon emissions as a country by providing better incentives to the general population, but also to big business to overhaul their entire operating systems and 'go green'. The Government should not be allowing other countries to start taking the lead on developing greener energy sources and more efficient ways of using the current energy we do have.

On a personal level, I think a carbon trading scheme is the most unhelpful environment idea the Government has had. The focus for business then becomes about how to maximise the emissions they are allowed, rather than each business reducing their emissions as much as possible.

Please, don't condemn our planet and our resources to an unsustainable future.

Kindest Regards.

Steven Johnson

Youth Worker.

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.

I am proud that I support green energy - I don't want my commitment to a better future for the world and the Australian economy (shifting to a 'green' economy) to be in vain.

Please empower ordinary Australians to be able to make a difference in the fight to reduce Australia's CO2 emissions.

Regards
Nicole Jones

I am writing to you as I am disappointed with the weak target set by the Government. The 5-15% is very minimal. Take for example the Wilkins ice shelves breaking away from Antarctica. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

I am a concerned member of society and I try to reduce my carbon footprint, however it is ridiculous that efforts made by individuals are not kept separate from industry. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) will enable industry to continue to pollute, as the effort individuals make will go as credits towards industry. By looking at having separate schemes for industry and individuals/community that would help. DON'T USE MY REDUCTIONS TO HELP INDUSTRY POLLUTE MY COUNTRY!

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.

LOOK AT WHAT GERMANY HAS BEEN ABLE TO DO! THEY DON'T EVEN HAVE AS MUCH SUN AS AUSTRALIA. By implementing a system that enables those who invest in the solar power to be able to get more money for the power they produce (better tariffs) etc. Surely we can stimulate a better more green economy while reducing our emissions.

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.

So please, review this system and listen to those in the know.

Regards,

Michelle Jonker

I am deeply concerned about the inadequate targets for reducing greenhouse emissions. Climate change is accelerating at an alarming rate. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) seems to be ill conceived and rewards big companies while minimising the efforts of individuals. We need a stronger target and a different scheme.

Many Australian's are willing to sacrifice and make compromises at the micro level if government can get it right at the macro level. The current plan is extremely discouraging.

Sincerely,
Dr. Belinda Smaill.

Setting aside the Governments inconsequential greenhouse gas target, I just do not believe that it is fair dinkum in its approach to the whole issue. We, the electors are being miss led. Government actions give the lie to its claimed policy intent.

Why no GROSS feedin tariff for green power generation?

Why free tradeable permits to major polluters?

Why legal off shore carbon trade with an artificially suppressed carbon price because of the free permit bonanza to producers?

Why a new brown coal power generator for Victoria?

Why no legislation to regulate air conditioning units?

Why no legislation to regulate the running/capacity of domestic and commercial a.c? Put a jumper on or open a window!

Why should a dirty industry be able to buy the credit for the energy I save by reducing personal emissions?

I know we have a neocon led world recession and high projected population growth relative to other nations, but I am really pissed off that this Government lies to me and treats me like a fool after making high minded statements to get elected.

Brian Dodd

I'm writing to support the Greens' position that the Government's 5-15% greenhouse gas reduction target is not sufficient to stem the effects of Climate Change and set us up for a better future with less dependence on fossil fuels.

The carbon reduction scheme currently proposed by the Rudd Government is not sufficient to make a difference in our overall emissions.

The Rudd Government was voted into office in 07 for a number of reasons - but one significant reason was that we believed a Labor government would heed the calls of Australians and set up a strong, forward-thinking and world-leading scheme to reduce our emissions.

Regards,

Clare M

A 5-15% target is not going to be enough if we want our kids and grandchildren to enjoy this planet. Step up and commit to something bigger. It's actually an embarrassing target. What sort of message are we sending to the rest of the world and to our kids? That it's not really our problem? That we only care a little bit? That we don't care if we keep hurting the planet because we won't be around to deal with the circumstances?

I know that the GFC is currently the big focus for the world, but no amount of money can buy us a new planet to live on.

Please help me to show my children that I care about the planet and about their future quality of life. Let's aim for something a little higher than 15%.

Simone Heydon

Despite the disbelief of some, there is no doubt whatsoever that the rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels is the major contributor to global warming. If urgent, strong action is not taken now, the result will be international political instability for my children's generation.

This problem cannot be tackled without cost - we must expect some economic sacrifices as individuals, as a nation, and a community of nations. Australia can be a leader - but our weak target must be improved before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share.

Our economy should be refocussed to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. For example, domestic photovoltaic electricity generation is a great opportunity, for which there is very considerable unexploited scope. If the government is serious about exploiting the economic benefits, it should immediately extend the subsidy to all households, without a means test.

John Kalman

The current proposal to reduce emissions by 5% is woefully inadequate. Now is the time to act, to promote renewable energy businesses by targeted funding, retraining employees in non-renewable sectors to work in renewables. We cannot claim to be setting any kind of example for the region (and the Pacific is most at risk) if we do not act decisively, with any eye for future trade and employment, we risk everything.

Simon Stroud

I'm extremely concerned by the government proposed minimal targets to reduce CO₂. Whilst I understand that it's vital to simply get a framework in place in the first instance, a strong and sensible target would also send a powerful message to the rest of the global community. 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 by 20% as a minimum 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.

Regards

Gilly Dempsey

I lived in London for a year, where there is very little left of the natural environment, and i was quite appalled at how polluted it was and how poor the quality of the food was due to the over-farming of the land. When i returned to Australia i had a renewed appreciation for how clean it is and how lucky we are to have a relatively unspoiled natural environment. Living in London was like looking into the future, and I found it quite frightening to realise that unless we change, Australia will be the same.

I don't think humans can have any quality of life without a clean environment and I can't fathom why the government has not committed to reducing greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. We have so much sunlight, solar power could be the way of the future and the government should be investing in it for the benefit of all.

I also believe the carbon pollution reduction scheme is just a clever way for industry to keep on polluting! Please do something now before we are living in an environment we can't save.

Yours sincerely

Katherine wilkinson

Now is not the time to be timid. The problem is far too serious. Almost every sequential piece of scientific research is telling us that climate change is happening much more rapidly than we previously thought.

Australia should be a leader, not a meek follower, in the urgent implementation of stronger carbon reduction targets. The Government's 5-15% target is not only inadequate, it will provide an excuse for other countries to fudge their responsibilities too.

Even worse, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, by imposing a floor on emissions, over-compensates polluters and discourages ordinary Australians from doing their bit at home and work.

Now, when big stimulus measures are required to bolster our sagging economy, is the perfect time to allocate a far larger proportion of spending towards setting up the infrastructure and framework for a low-carbon future. Cleaner, greener energy will create jobs and boost our exports.

We have the knowledge and the creativity. All we need is the political will. We are relying on you, our politicians, to act responsibly. In doing so, you have the potential to set up this country as a world leader in renewable and sustainable energy. It is shameful that Australia, with all its resources - a huge land area, long coastline, long sunshine hours and exposure to strong winds - has done so little to harness them.

Our generation may just be lucky enough to escape the worst consequences of what we are doing to the planet. Should we fail to wake up to our responsibilities right now, the next generation won't be so lucky.

Sincerely

Jonathan Tanner

As Australians that voted for major reductions in carbon pollution (aka >40% by 2020) we are very disappointed and disillusioned with the current goal being only 5-15% emission reduction target.

To us, this is totally unacceptable - as our representative in the Senate, we sincerely demand a more encompassing, more life sustaining target of 50% by 2020. Surely given all the latest scientific data including the massive melting of Antarctica ice shelf indicates, together with average Australian joe & joanne-public responses, PLUS worldwide grass-root options - You all should be under NO illusion that what is required is nothing less than a 50% reduction target by 2020, together with major federal assistance for alternative energy creation.

Coal exports are going to die a quick death in a very short time-frame given the worldwide movement to replace coal polluting emissions with non polluting alternatives. We as Australians realise that our working communities will suffer job losses and declining export revenues. Such times call for an open and honest appraisal, hard decisions in the interest of all and certainly NOT free credits to the coal industry who will only use the monies for themselves as exceptional profits without doing the slightest for our communities or our countries health.

Be strong, be a strength of vision and help lift the pitiful standard to one we can be proud of, one we will accept as our duty to strive for and pay for the next decades to ensure those after us will have a better environment to live in.

Yours sincerely.

Mr. Grahame & Mrs. Brigitte Kelly + family.

I believe that Australia should lead the way in action on climate change. We need to set strong targets for greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Strong action on climate change will make Australia a world leader in green technologies, strengthening our economy for the times ahead.

I urge you to reconsider Australia's pollution reduction targets to 50% by 2020.

Dr Carly Taylor

We need to be proactive about climate change. More is needed to be done before the ice caps melt and we all float into the sea. 5% is not enough, not nearly enough.

Please do more,

Peggy

The time is right for this country to lead the way. It seems important to the Government to be heard in the global village - there is no better way to be heard, and to set the best example by committing to reducing our carbon emissions to 50% by 2020.

PLEASE show the rest of the world that we think this is one of the most important issues facing the world today. Also, please invest in green energy of all types - our climate is ideally suited to solar and wind energy - it's so obvious that this is a growth industry (unlike the coal industry!)

Thank you in anticipation for doing the right thing.

Lisa Newey

I am one of the many Australians, a supporter of the government, who is nevertheless dismayed, disappointed and distressed at the woefully inadequate response of the Labor government to the global environmental crisis.

Leaving aside the obvious fact that we should be acting together as a society to combat this terrible threat, I simply cannot understand why the government does not seize the obvious political opportunity that the situation presents.

Labor should seize the high moral ground by making a very simple point: the Opposition says that the economy cannot afford action to save the planet. This actually means that they do not accept the seriousness of climate change. Everyone can understand the simple message: no environment = no economy.

Labor needs to hammer that message at every opportunity. That means also that Labor must act, making an example that will carry the Australian people with it.

To do anything else is a betrayal of our country, our planet, and our children.

I believe that the Australian people are waiting for the government to act, and that they will unite behind a leadership with the courage and foresight to do the right thing.

Sincerely,
Nick Eckstein.

I believe that the present government is not doing enough to address the issue of slowing climate change. Recent scientific evidence suggests that the change is happening faster than previously believed. Additionally, no government seems to be taking significant enough steps to attempt to reduce and subsequently halt the emission of CO₂.

The argument of potential damage to our economy is flawed. Real action to reduce Carbon emissions will create jobs. Our economy is also likely to be more significantly negatively impacted by inaction or weak policies than by taking a tougher stance, earlier.

I urge that Senate enquiry to go back to the government and DEMAND tougher reduction targets.

Graham FIRTH

Please take climate change seriously and listen to the Australian people when we say that the current targets are embarrassingly weak. The Carbon Pollution scheme is so badly designed that there is absolutely no incentive for householders and local community to reduce their pollution. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the environment.

I believe that Australia should do 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.

Please listen

Rebecca Rutter

As an Australian resident, a volunteer fire fighter and a father of a child, I am concerned that precious time is being wasted before the serious issue of climate change is addressed in a meaningful way.

An increasing body of scientific evidence has established that climate change is a real global threat and that Australia with its fragile climate and ecosystems is particular vulnerable. It is further proven beyond reasonable doubt that man-made emissions contribute to the situation.

Australia is a rich country that can afford to take meaningful action, it has the resources and know-how to be a major contributor on the world stage in the fight against climate change. It has much to gain in taking a leading position in the world and much to lose, if global efforts to curb climate change should fail.

Moreover, in the last federal elections, the Australian people have given the government a clear mandate to initiate serious measures which also would entail some financial sacrifice.

Since Professor Garnaut has presented his report, in which he urged to adopt solid emission targets, further evidence has emerged that the climate change is progressing at a much greater speed as previously was anticipated.

I therefore would like to request that:

The government commits to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia enters December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen with strong target in order to lead other countries by example.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is amended so that polluters are not over-compensated at the expense of the community and environment.

The government will help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

In the current debate about the cost of inaction versus the cost of action, one aspect that tends to get overlooked is the cost of meaningless action versus the cost of meaningful action.

Let's get it right and do what scientists recommend, not lobbyists.

Sincerely,

Dirk Gardener

the government target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution is not enough! we need to be leading the world not lagging behind other countries on action against climate change.

not enough basic, simple measures have been taken. eg double glazing is standard in california and spain and greece- places with a similar climate to ours. here it is expensive because very few architects and builders insist on it. making it compulsory would reduce the cost and also significantly save energy.

we have been too long with the head in the sand and the labour government should be changing that!! that's why we voted for you!!

sincerely,

sue gray

The government has shirked its responsibility on perhaps the most crucial issue the world will ever face.

Climate change and pollution in general will threaten humanity in the next century. By putting in place such a paltry target, the government has shown its lack of consideration of this most serious matter.

Not only that, but the CPRS has major failings and needs to be reviewed.

Australia has to play a significant part in the world stage, for the sake of humanity and particularly for the sake of Australian citizens.

My next vote will be most heavily influenced by environmental policy.

Sincerely,

Simon Marek

Action on climate change may already be too late.

The greatest possible effort is needed NOW, even if this means radical life-style changes for wealthy Western societies.

Yesterday (6 Apr 09) a major sea-ice breakup in the Antarctic was reported which may have a very significant effect on land ice melting and therefore sea-level rises.

Governments owe it to the future to act now, and to act much more aggressively than political considerations would normally allow.

Sincerely,
Alynn Pratt

Dear Sir /Madam,

I am extremely concerned that the Australian government is not hearing the people of Australia when they express their concerns over climate change. We are all working hard to try and reduce our emissions, but we feel powerless when the government does not assist by implementing powerful policies on Carbon Pollution Reduction; implementation of Green Renewable Energies; and broadscale reconsideration of revegetation.

I'm particularly concerned that the voices of people in industry, who cannot see past the economics to the reality of what is happening in the world are being given too much sway. If drastic climate change happens, economics will cease to matter. What we're talking about here is survival.

Please consider items such as:

- Extensive revegetation, particularly in areas of land which have been extensively cleared, and are perhaps unviable now for farming with the water crisis.
- Use of Agrichar to improve soil fertility and lower carbon emissions.
- A Carbon trading scheme which genuinely cuts emissions. I feel that 5-15% is a very weak, and disappointing target for us to have set.
- Encouragement and quick roll-out of renewable green energies, including solar, geo thermal, wind and wave power.
We have the opportunity to be a leader in this field, which will surely stand us in good stead in the years to come.
- A consistent and sensible approach to domestic solar supply. I would also like to see it made economically feasible for large factories to install solar arrays on their roofs.
- Setting aside land to be wildlife 'links' - so that animals and to some extent plants have a chance to migrate to areas with a more appropriate climate for their needs.

Please show real leadership on this issue. Our future depends on it.

Thank you,
Katherine Masiulonis

To whom it may concern,

I was extremely dissatisfied with the government announced its soft target on climate change. It indicated to me a lack of understanding of both how important a strong decision on this matter is, as well as the potential advantage to Australia's growth in the future as one of the leaders in green technology.

The Carbon Polluting Reduction Scheme was originally intended to make polluting energy sources economically unattractive, however if the current scheme goes ahead as planned these polluting industries will be overcompensated for this, completely undermining the aims of the scheme. If Australia is serious both about tackling climate change and being a world leader in policy on this issue it is essential that the targets are increased and that a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is put in place that will actually reduce our dependence on high carbon emission energy sources. The potential economic advantage of supporting research and development of new, green energy sources has been ignored by the government. This is an area that could create important jobs and income for the country in these difficult economic times.

I hope this matter, and the wishes of the people of Australia, will be carefully considered before a final decision is made by government.

Regards,
Helen Stolp

To whom it may concern:

The current target from 5 to 15% is not adequate to halt global warming. This is Australia's chance to lead by example and show the rest of the world how important this issue should be considered. Only by taking leadership will other countries follow and can we stand any chance to save the environment long term. Hiding behind a low target is not only cowardly, it's also destructive.

What's more, more thought should be given to the hundreds of thousands of Australians who are already taking steps to minimise their footprint on the environment. Passing on these savings to big polluting industries completely misses the point.

I'm looking forward to hearing your response.

Kind regards,
Nathalie Nuijens

Dear Mr Rudd,

I voted for your party because I believe you were serious about climate change! It was very nice to see you ratify Kyoto so soon. However this seems now to be just window dressing!

Your government's target of 5-15% reduction by 2020 is FAR too low. I believe we need to set a target of at least 25%.

Furthermore your CPRS scheme favours the big polluters and disadvantages small business and individuals!

Plus you are helping the car industry, which is one of the big un-necessary polluters, world wide. A man does not need over a ton of metal, plastic and glass to move from a to b! It would be much better to help the emerging environmental industries. Car owners must be taxed for the pollution they cause and the true cost of the infrastructure.

Please take advice from the experts you have in the environmental field, and NOT from the polluters, or the world will get rapidly worse! The polar ice caps are now melting at greater rate than at any time in Man's history, so we can expect even worse events than the bush fires and floods we have been having, unless you pull your finger out!

Australia need to lead the world, not follow miles behind!

Ian M Sims.

I believe in cause and effect and karma.

All religions and spiritual groups warn of honouring money.

We have been living in a time of greed, power, corruption and destruction of the planet for our consumption. It is now time to stop and wake up.

If you don't put oil and water in your car what do you think will happen? Why is it that you think we can chop all forests, suck every thing out of the earth and suffocate the atmosphere and then think nothing will happen. That is what I call, cause, and the effect is what we are now seeing.

5% reduction is putting MONEY BEFORE PEOPLE

Stop the fear politics and do something positive for all.

Regards,

Carolyn

Dear Sir,

I am embarrassed by the weak effort our government is making on 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 (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.

Please reconsider in the name of the future of the planet, its people and life as we know it

Regards

Mike

Dear Leader,

i am very concerned by the weak greenhouse policy we seem to be choosing. there are several weaknesses in my opinion.

1. the target is too low to avoid dangerous climate change, according to scientific studies. perhaps we should start small, but we need to explain how we will ramp up to meet the goal.

2. the incentives are perverse. there is a floor to emissions which means that individual people and small businesses have no incentive to contribute. this is exactly the wrong way to go about it because it is by individual actions and local education that our next cohort of leaders will make sure to keep the carbon in check.

we are in a time of crisis. australians can rise creatively to almost any challenge when the goal is clear and the means are at hand. measures such as the floor and monetary subsidies so that families can just keep burning the petrol as if nothing was wrong, are sending an ominous sign that we have given up. nothing could be further from the truth. how about taking the same money for the subsidies and investign it in the longer term research and public transport and building subsidies for energy efficiency etc.

give us strong goals with clear incentives and we can all respond. we are not weak, we can bear almost any burden.

yours sincerely,
andy&

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 at what's happening to the ice shelf.

Please consider changing your views and policies.

Regards Kathy Kroes

..The Government needs to take Climate Change seriously. We need to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 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 Cope.

Marie Fitzgerald

Dear govt advisor/Senate,

The govt response to climate change is inadequate and must be made stronger.

We must set an example and show the world that we are serious about climate change policy.

5-15% reduction in emissions is not enough - 20-25% reduction is needed by 2020.

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.

Sincerely

Paul Downes

Please take climate change seriously. We need to reduce greenhouse gases by more than 5%. What happened to Peter Garrett and his ideals... our beds are still burning. we need to set a much higher and better thought out target to make a real difference for our children. Please reconsider this.

Punita Boardman
mother of 2

The world has reached a great opportunity for change. The 'perfect storm' of events across the economic and environmental climates allow us to rethink...and importantly - REPRIORITISE.

We have thrown good money after bad at the economy, as yet, to little avail. Yet the environment has been screaming for help for decades, and is all but ignored (and no, rebating some costs of insulation and solar heating IS NOT supporting the environment - it simply appeases those who do not fully understand the gravity of our situation.)

Toughen up our targets, increase the penalties for non-compliance, reward those communities and people that are achieving solutions and making changes. Support the scientists, thinkers, pioneers and their ideas; their new industries that work with and for the environment.

No one denies there will be negative consequences, but we humans are resilient and can make the necessary adjustments to encourage the health of ourselves AND environment well into the future.

Make us, help us and support us in making changes for the health of this world. Toughen up on tackling climate change.

Yours,

Kirsten Gorton

Dear Mr Rudd and government,

Please take notice of the world's scientific community re. the threat posed by climate change. The threat requires an immediate, sustained and stronger response than the weak one you have initially adopted. For the earth's sake ignore the calls of the ignorant economists. Their thinking is flawed.

Act responsibly to commit to much higher reductions. Show the way. Renewable energy will be able to cope.

Yours sincerely,
Max James M Env Sci

As a physics PhD from a farming background and having travelled extensively, I can appreciate the science of climate change, the practical realities of tempest and drought and place we Australians occupy in the world.

My reality is that sacrifice now has a chance, just a chance, of preventing catastrophe for my six grandchildren and fellow members of their generation around the world.

I plead with national decision-makers to push really hard the barriers that threaten to cause this catastrophe by greatly increasing the targets for carbon pollution reduction, even if you believe that it will be political suicide for you. Your sacrifice and the sacrifice you impose on our current generation will make you heroes in history.

Very sincerely
Murray Hollis

The government must stop wasting time by pandering to those who make money by emitting carbon.

There has been too much procrastination. It is time that strong leadership stood up and spelt out to the world that we have to make sufficient cuts NOW, to save our own human habitat, and avoid unthinkable and unreversable devastation in the future.

On a dead planet, our bank accounts won't matter a damn.

John Enkelmann

My whole life, I've grown up with advertisements espousing the benefits of recycling, saving power, planting trees, helping the environment survive. We said no to CFCs because of the damage it caused to the ozone layer. We installed power saving devices in our houses, and we're turning to hybrid, green energy efficient cars.

So I ask you, why is the government projecting a very modest 5-15% greenhouse pollution reduction? Why is the government, who encouraged us to make these changes in the first place, not standing up and taking on a greater, more realistic approach to pollution reduction?

The CPRS NEEDS redesigning to ensure that high output polluters are no overcompensated, and to ensure that the differences enacted by the community at large really make a difference. Don't just use the margin we, the public, have created to allow high output polluters to keep going in their old pattern of output.

Instead of capping ourselves at 15%, why aren't we allowing ourselves room to advance beyond that level? Why are we imposing a limit on ourselves when we all know that the more improvements we can make, the better a future we have for our environment.

I've grown up being bombarded by the government telling us to take preventative measures before we got to this point. Well, we are at the point where that isn't going to work anymore. We need to take serious and ambitious action now. The government is supposed to represent the people, and make change for the benefit of the people. Well, the people are speaking, and we want this done, and done right.

Kaelee Dean

The Carbon Pollution Reduction scheme does not go far enough to reduce Australia's environmental impact. As the "Lucky Country" we have enough skills and renewable energy resources that could be developed to allow us to reach a 50% pollution reduction target by 2020 when combined with increasing energy efficiency.

The CPRS emissions 'floor' should also be removed to allow Australians and their businesses to reduce emissions as much as possible

Thanks,
Henry Telfer

Most of the major environment groups are calling for stronger carbon emission reduction targets. It needs to be at least 50% by 2020, but I feel Australia could still support stronger targets than that. The Garnaut report calls for stronger targets than the government has decided upon - why commission a report when you don't take heed of its findings? Australia needs to be a leader internationally on climate change before it is too late. Already we are seeing massive changes, and Penny Wong herself has said that the collapse of the ice bridge at the Wilkins Ice Shelf is a sign for sceptics that climate change is happening, however she decided that despite this, we don't need to increase the weak targets. I ask the senate committee where the logic is in that?

I also cannot believe the handouts polluters are going to get with the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. There is no incentive for the big polluters to reduce their emissions, and the more individuals reduce their emissions, the more the polluters can increase their emissions. It does not sound very logical does it?

In summary, I support a stronger target for reducing emissions, and a better designed carbon pollution reduction scheme. I support a growth in "green jobs" which would include a focus on renewable energies. I support a move away from power derived from coal and I would be happy to pay more for electricity from renewable sources (in fact I already do this).

Yours sincerely,
Dr Aaron Hollins

The estimate published last week that all it would take for Australia to become totally self sufficient on renewables was half the cost of the Federal Stimulus package was sobering reading. Even if it cost the same, what better way to both stimulate the real ECONOMY than to give ourselves a present like this.

If making people feel secure about their lives is one way out of the GFC, then I know what would do it for me. Imagine waking up to the news that our government had decided to eliminate fossil fuels by 2040.

Instead we have this horrible compromise born of short term thinking. I expected better from a Labour government. Ditch the fossil fuel lobby and their subsidies (both visible and hidden) and get serious about climate change.

This target must be thrown out and replaced with at least 20%.

For the sake of the world, don't just twiddle your thumbs.

Stuart Whitelaw

Chartered Architect

Please aim for a higher target in reducing Australia's greenhouse emissions. The latest breaking-up of part of an Antarctic ice-shelf shows how global warming is having a serious effect on Polar icecaps, and this in turn will raise ocean levels, endangering small island communities.

Neville Threlfall

I voted green with Labour preferences at the last election with the specific intention of providing the now government with a clear mandate for action on climate change.

All evidence available to me as an environmental scientist states clearly and unequivocally that inaction endangers not only the precious ecology of our continent but our way of life.

Thus it follows that the ONLY reasonable response to this crisis is direct and meaningful action, that will not only provide significant carbon and methane reduction targets enforceable by law. But also provide Australia the impetus to demand greater action from its international peers.

Furthermore I find the 5% target currently proposed pitiful and insulting.

Sincerely
Kim Lang

Dear Senators,

Thank you for inviting submissions to the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy.

As you hear from experts from around the country I urge you to listen to Australia's best climate scientists and think of the future we are leaving for our kids.

If the rest of the world followed the Rudd Government's weak targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 we would face catastrophic climate change – with more deadly bushfires¹, costly floods and cyclones.

Australia needs to champion an effective global agreement if we are to avoid devastating effects on our environment and economy. We need to set a strong climate change policy before the crucial Copenhagen climate change conference in December. This is the best – and possibly last – chance the world will have to solve the climate crisis.

Australia needs to lead by example and increase its weak 2020 target to at least 30%, moving to 40% in the context of a global agreement.

I ask that your committee recommend policies that make strong cuts in Australia's carbon pollution, make Australia energy smart and drive investment in renewable energy to make it cheaper than coal power.

Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green Collar jobs, not destroy them as the big polluters claim.²

In 2007, Australia voted for strong action on climate change. In 2009, I urge you to use your important role to recommend Australia makes a response to the climate crisis that future generations will thank us for.

Yours sincerely,

Robin Brown

¹A 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.

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

Dear Senate Committee,

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.

Negative reports from credible sources that have flooded the media are already having a negative effect on citizens. My 70 year old mother has now decided not to have the solar panel installed on her roof that she was intending on spending her December stimulus package money on purely because of the federal government's CPRS. The low targets are already doing more harm than good - they must be raised to encourage the community to take responsibility for their actions.

I am concerned that while the scheme supports dirty power generators with free carbon credits, it fails to support recycling business, who receives few government subsidies.

I am also concerned about building standards. My partner and I recently purchased a 4 year old apartment in Collingwood. It has no insulation and gets very hot in summer. We also have no opportunity for solar or gas hot-water to be installed, no ability to harvest waste water or to have this installed, and no ability to install solar panels. We will never get the agreement of the entire body corporate who would incur a hefty expense. They are mostly rental property owners and don't have the incentives that residents do. These features should have been incorporated into the design. I find it difficult to believe that this was not and still is not mandatory. It is vital that these features become mandatory in all new dwellings, particularly high density dwellings where renters and owners have no, or extremely limited capacity to install environmentally features.

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.

Yours sincerely
Paula Johnson

I congratulated Rudd on the refreshing change of honesty, integrity and committment he brought to Australia when his government swept into power over Teflon Johnny who espoused that Greed and Lying was good.

I am not that stupid that we must have jobs etc, but his change to a 5%-15% target is is extremely inadequate and is a somewhat weak target. The proposed CPRS benefits polluters and will only encourage the same financial hijackers who have been at the forefront of the financial mess the world is now in.

World leading research bodies like the CSIRO have been recommending changes for decades to be ignored by successive Federal and State Governments. Finite resources like H2O and Open space have been plundered by the big end of town without any respect for the environment and future generations.

Its now Time.....

James Thompson

I am almost four years old. I want to reach 44, maybe even 104 years of age.
I love the planet. Get real for me and my friends.
Zoe Kerbey

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing to strongly encourage you to push harder for greenhouse gas emission reductions. The science seems to be overwhelmingly of the opinion that something more drastic than what the government is currently proposing needs to be done.

Please listen to the overwhelming majority of experts in this issue - the scientists.

Regards,

John Kis

To whom it may concern,

When elected, it appeared that the new Federal Government understood the need for immediate action to avoid rapid climate change. It has therefore been disappointing to see that the proposals for mitigating the problems, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, are unlikely to assist in resolving the issues with which the world is now faced.

I understand that there is considerable scientific evidence to suggest that climate change is occurring far more rapidly than was previously believed. Regardless of whether scientific predictions are considered accurate, it is certain that the number of extreme weather events has increased significantly over the past decade.

I believe that the Government targets are not strong enough to ensure that Australia plays a role in avoiding dangerous climate change. In addition, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is poorly designed and will ensure that greenhouse gas emissions cannot be reduced beyond the targets set, so that the contribution of individuals and small businesses will simply allow larger businesses to increase their emissions.

As an individual who is doing her best to minimise her impact on the environment (I don't own a car, buy 100% solar power, have stopped using planes and use very little electricity), it is disappointing to think that the Government's proposed commitments will mean I'm wasting my time.

I believe it is vital, both to our own country and globally, that the Australian Government sets stronger targets and works towards achieving them in a manner that is equitable to all Australians and all businesses.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Lustig

The people of Victoria know more than ever the devastating effects climate change can have. A long drought and extreme temperatures have left many homeless, and many dead. We need to take strong action to honour those who lost their lives, to show that it was not in vain, that we learnt a valuable lesson from tragedy. Please change your policies so that we can go back to the 'good old days' of bush fires, and not suffer increasingly more fire storms as we did in February.

In particular I ask you to change your policies regarding solar power. It is essential for our future that we are able to access this renewable source of power in a real way, rather than the half or quarter measures currently in place. In a country such as ours with abundant sunlight, every home should be collecting their own power when able, and SELLING back into the grid wherever possible.

In addition to this, I ask that our states water policies are looked at in a more sustainable way... during the times when it does rain, uncountable amounts of water is lost off rooves and down the gutters. Please act to fund a water tank for every home, before large scale projects are begun..

Your Government was elected by myself and many others largely on the strength of your environmental reform promises, please do not succumb to industry and lobby groups with financial gain as the main concern, rather look ahead to the future.

There is no point protecting industries that would be devastated by large scale natural disasters if we do not act to protect our environment from further damage.

Pleas act now to reduce our emmissions by at least 20% in the next 5 years, and by 50% by 2020 before it is too late

Regards

Kate Tunney

I hold the view that the Rudd Government received a strong mandate at the last federal election to take a strong stand on climate change. I applaud the signing of the Kyoto Protocol, but subsequent action from the Rudd Government has demonstrated to me that the signing was of no more than symbolic value. The 5 -15% target is totally inadequate, both for its effect of climate change and because it provides no leadership for a strong world-wide effort. The economic crisis facing the world is of little consequence if we lose our capacity to live on this planet. Australia must take a very strong stance to the UNCCC in Copenhagen. The proposed CPRS is a dreadful piece of draft policy and must be amended. I am appalled to discover that the Rudd Government had bowed to pressure from the big polluters and that the thoughtful actions of individuals and small businesses to save on their ecological footprint, will only go to serve the interests of the big polluters.

Yours sincerely

Moiria Scollay

I'm disappointed with the Government's inadequate targets and attitudes towards climate change. Like many Australians I feel that it is embarrassing on an international level and the entire policy needs to be re-addressed. This might be a short message but it echos the voices of the Greens and those who are pro-environment.

Thanks,

Dave Micenko

The damage we are doing will not have a devastating effect upon us but it will have on the children growing up today. Think of what has been lost since we, in our 60's, were young until now. The rivers which once had fish and crabs are now without either. This may not be because of climate change but it is an early example of environmental change. Climate change: rises in temperature, sea level and tropical diseases will be far worse than this.

Bob Chambers

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. Worst of all, Australia's weak stance will undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change.

You don't need to be an expert to see that a 5% greenhouse reduction target isn't good enough to stop dangerous climate change. And you don't need to be an expert to make a short submission today.

Do the right thing for our long term future.

Thank you,
Jeff russell

Dear Sirs and Mesdames,

I am appalled by the weak 5-15% percent emissions reduction target currently set by the Government. According to all current research it is clearly not enough to effectively combat climate change and does not put Australia in a position to effect significant change on its own behalf or internationally.

Scientific findings show climate change is escalating faster than first predicted. Humanity must move faster to counteract it.

Australia must improve its emissions reduction target and must come up with a better scheme than the current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme which allows polluting industries far too much compensation while not rewarding smaller businesses and general members of the public who will be trying to reduce their individual or household carbon footprints. In fact from what I understand, the more individuals reduce emissions the more it gives the polluting industries leeway to lag on reducing their emissions. This is madness.

Individuals must be encouraged and if possible rewarded to reduce, polluting industries must be penalised the more they pollute and renewable sources of energy must be fast-tracked. And why can't the captains of polluting industries be given stakes in these new industries so they can make a transition rather than feel they have to keep in their old ways to keep making money. Same profits, better methods and outcomes.

The mindset not be allowed to be that jobs will be lost in the polluting industries, rather that new jobs will open in renewable industries. With forethought and training why can't a coal miner be re-trained to be a wind or solar energy worker?

Both the emissions target and the CPRS Scheme must be redesigned in time for the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen - and before it's too late for us not to suffer the effects of irreversible climate change.

Yours sincerely,
Catherine Rogers

To the Secretary, Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy.....

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, 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 \$1,000 for every household in Australia. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem fo 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.

It will cost us more not to do something than to do something as Sir Nicholas Stern has already said time and time again.

Let's get 'up there' with the science for a change and lead the world as it is our place to do so.

The scientists are the ones who really need to be listened to as they really know far more than most people in political circles I'm afraid to say..... the likes of Tim Flannery for instance.

I look forward to seeing the Carbon Polluter's Reward Scam sent to the wall once and for all!

Yours Sincerely,

Jane Manifold

Dear Mr Rudd

I was so happy when you signed Kyoto as one of your first efforts in the job. Yeah, I thought, we are starting to take climate seriously.

My confidence has recently been eroded by the small reduction targets set. We all know the industries of the future will be green ones... why not propel us into the future by making strong targets and spawning new industry?

Please do more... it's why I voted for you.

Sarah Pye

I would like to voice opinion about climate change. We need to reduce our greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 AT LEAST to make a change for our future generations. Why doesn't Australia be first to introduce radical laws for climate change. We live in the country and we are very aware of the water we use or don't use, the removal of our rubbish, the use of our car etc. the city people need to be made aware. Maybe they should be without water for a day and see what it feels like. Every time our electricity goes out we don't have water but we are very resourceful and we all need to learn new ways to live. Excess is finished!!!

Industry too has a lot to do before it is acceptable.

5-15% is TOO WEAK - be strong Mr Rudd and make radical changes.

Thank you for listening

Revati

To Penny Wong,

Climate change is the most important issue facing our generation and your governments response has been woefully inadequate. Many people voted for your party due to the concerns about this issue and have been badly let down.

The World can not afford to wait. The collapse of the ice shelf in the Arctic last week makes this matter urgent.

I have personally reduced my greenhouse emissions by over 50% and feel that the government's targets are a joke.

There won't be an economy to worry about it - so this should be made the top priority. Creating an sustainable energy industry would also create jobs for the long term and should be what the governments focus.

Regards,

Tamara de Silva

Dear Mr Rudd, To have any creditability at all on climate change, you must immediately change your policy. President Obama has given a commitment that his country will do so much better than Australia in reducing emissions. We must also adopt better strategies to reduce the need for energy. Legislation that each new home built must have solar power and adequate insulation is a no cost and easy method to start.

If you want to be know the the man who has really tackled the hard problems, then start now in adopting real policy that will significantly reducing emissions. judy petroeschovsky

To whom it may concern:

Government targets are woefully inadequate to address the problems of climate change. The latest news on the antarctic ice shelf and bridge show just how dire is the problem.

A real target may just encourage other countries to be proactive. Pandering to lobby groups and suggesting unrealistic minimums so as not to disadvantage any of the groups, simply disadvantages the planet which will rush headlong into oblivion.

sincerely
Diana Neale

To whom it may concern:

Many of us are disappointed/appalled at the feeble undertaking by our government about the intended pace of reducing carbon emissions. Surely there is no point in prioritising trying to sustain the economy at the expense of the planet itself!

And the worst of it is that any individual efforts we make ourselves to reduce greenhouse emissions are not only immediately cancelled out by the policy of granting carbon credits to large polluting companies whose right to continue their polluting practices is automatically extended in proportion to the amount we individuals may have saved.

This is pragmatism which has gone haywire.

While much that our government does is to be applauded, these targets are totally unsatisfactory and I call upon you to exert every capacity you have to strengthen our targets.

Sincerely

Helen Pavlin

To whom it may concern,

I believe that Australia's climate change targets should be stronger to ensure adequate protection of our environment and a better life for future generations. I would support a target of up to 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020. The efforts of individuals should also be considered as I take a great deal of effort to minimise my levels of pollution.

I believe we should be making a greater commitment - thats what I thought would happen when I voted Labour at the last election. I am somewhat disappointed by their lack of commitment.

Regards

Renee Thompson

You guys are moving too slowly on most of the climate change issues. Let the Australian government be the world leaders and not the followers. Make seriously radical decisions and make the rest of the world sit up, take notice and follow us. We can do it because we are a 'can do' nation. Don't worry about that weak opposition who have no decent alternatives except to make critical comments about anything Labour tries to do. Do it now !!!!

Michael

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 in half by 2020.

I am willing to make the hard decisions and sacrifices necessary on a personal and on a business level to contribute to that reduction.

All I would like to see is some leadership from the Government that is based on sound scientific research and not on juggling competing market interests.

Stephan Mavrakis

MR Rudd I voted for you, for serious gutsy change.

Jobs are the excuse for inactivity. It will be a whole lot more than jobs soon enough if we do not act now. Even now, its almost too late, so lets close the gate and change the script.

Ross Levinson

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

I think the present Gov approach to action on climate change is minimal but better than the previous Gov. What have we got a minister for environment for when he seems to do nothing about conservation of such places Murray River and Coorong Lakes? What have we got a minister for water for when they also do nothing to resolve the problems of said regions? How much time do they think we have? according to scientific research not a lot. Regards Kym Buttery..

Yours sincerely,
Kym Buttery

During the last federal election one of the key reasons I - and many of my friends - voted for the Labor Party was their stated position on climate change. The change of Government presented a huge opportunity for Australia to do something meaningful in response to climate change and to become a world leader in this regard. Imagine, then, my huge disappointment at the announcement of the pathetic proposed 5-15% target, which is tantamount to doing nothing at all. This weak target is completely inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change and undermines efforts to form crucial international agreement, and must be improved before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

To make things worse, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be 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.

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.

It's time for the Government to get serious about tackling climate change and to send a clear message to Australians that the problem cannot be solved without REAL sacrifice. This means making difficult decisions and forcing polluting industries to change, even if that means short term negative impacts upon certain businesses (and associated job losses) in exchange for developing sustainable industries longer term. Bending to industry pressure and setting weak emissions targets sends the message to Australia that the Labor Government is NOT serious about its election promises.

Jeremy Pollard

Dear Sir

It is with great respect I write today and ask that you consider deeply the people's need for your government to be held accountable for the reductions of Australia's greenhouse pollution. With action in implementing much higher targets all Australians will honour you in history as way showers, people of integrity, vision and heart, that dared to step forward and bring real change on behalf of not just Australians but for all humanity.

Be wayshowers of integrity and cause other governments all around the world to sit up, shape up and act for the people they so boldly say they represent.

Through listening to those of us also willing to speak up and be seen you will show us your integrity. Will you be proud of that? Will you be honoured for that? I truly hope so. Honour the position you have been voted to by the people of Australia to make a difference to the greatest degree possible in this instance.

With sincere thanks

Susie Cochrane

I am very disappointed with our federal government's weak "action" on climate change. I had hopes when this government was elected that it would take the issue seriously. The 5-15% reduction target is nowhere near what is needed to avoid the catastrophic warming towards which we are now heading, as evidenced by such changes as the faster than expected melting of the Arctic summer sea ice. We have nothing to gain and much to lose by not committing to reduce greenhouse pollution by 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020.

The CPRS is just shifting the deckchairs on the Titanic - it has been shown that it may even lead to an increase in carbon emissions. It will discourage individuals and small businesses from taking measures to reduce their energy use and emissions when they see that their efforts are used to allow the big polluters to continue to pollute.

As a wealthy nation, Australia should be setting an example of responsible leadership, not undermining efforts to reach international agreement. It makes economic sense to take strong measures to prevent dangerous climate change, which is far more of a threat to the wellbeing of our society than the (wrongly) perceived threat to our economies - is this threat really loss of votes as a result of loss of profit for big polluters?

The renewable energy sector will provide employment and adequate wealth if it is properly supported by government. Look at countries like Sweden - it is possible to phase out fossil fuels and replace them with renewable resources. We have the technology - all that is needed now is political will.

Nor is it just a matter of business as usual, just with renewables - our excessive consumption of goods and materials (the manufacture and transport of which use huge amounts of energy and resources) and energy need to be reduced. This can be achieved partly through governments facilitating the development of communities which are more self-sufficient in terms of resource and energy use, transport, consumption and production.

If we are to have a future, we don't really have a choice!

Yours faithfully,
Lyn Godfrey

.. and I'd quite like to see it survive.

Therefore please start treating us like adults - paint a realistic picture: yes there will be sacrifices, yes it won't be easy - yes we're going to try.

Let's lead the world and set an example. Real reduction targets and a commitment to spending on developing breakthrough new technologies that the rest of the planet will want to adopt.

thank you,

Pam Newton

Dear Senators

When our current government announced that they were serious about tackling climate change I felt a tremendous sense of hope that maybe the days of being afraid of stepping boldly into the new era in which innovation, taking responsibility and protecting our world for future generations was about to begin.

However the announcement of the 5% target and the flawed CPRS which favours polluters resoundingly dashed these hopes. Doing what the Rudd Government has done is worth than doing nothing. They have promised so much, got elected on the strength of this and delivered so little.

Is this what our Labor governments of our present and the future represent? Is their focus going to be on talking the talk, but not walking the walk? We have that same situation here in Qld with Anna Bligh's Labor government spruiking their environmental credential on one side of their face and pushing for the destruction of the internationally significant Mary River and Great Sandy Strait on the other side of their face.

We have tremendous opportunities to be a better society everywhere we look. These opportunities require change, but not necessarily sacrifice, particularly if managed properly. The chance to implement an effective and progressive scheme for curtailing Australia's Greenhouse Gas emissions together with a target of 50% reduction in GHG emissions by 2020 is one such chance.

Please don't blow it for our future generations. Take action now that we can be proud of. Bring the community with you and leave the polluters lobbyist behind. Be leaders that inspire us not demoralise us.

Yours sincerely

Tanzi Smith