

5-15% reductions are pointless. We should be committing to a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

Climate change is a real and immediate problem, and Australia should be a global leader on the issue. Let's stand up for what we believe in.

Thanks,
Joe Mills

Dear Sir/Madam

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

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

Setting Feed-in tariffs for renewable energy - and making a commitment to build no more coal-fired power stations are steps we must take. Coal does not represent the future - it must represent the past - quickly.

Yours Faithfully,

Roger Loughbrough

It's not enough!!! If you want a planet for the future of our children to live in then be bold about the levels set for reducing greenhouse pollution. 5-15% is not enough! Be the change you wish to see in the world, lead other countries to take greater measure by leading the way!

ROBYN

If we are to be serious about tackling dangerous climate change then the Government must take a strong stance based on science.

Inaction will cost more than action.

A 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020 is necessary for a future we can live in.

Yours sincerely

Martin Pritchard

I believe that Australia should set a target level that is closer to the levels sought by James Hansen (NASA). We should set a target that is greater than 20% reduction by 2020 so that our efforts must be more than easily achieved adjustments. It must include a decrease in coal-fired power stations as they reach age of replacement ie new power stations from now on must be solar-powered, wind-powered, and geothermal (and wave power).

I believe it is a waste of time and money to seek an add-on to present coalpowered stations for carbon sequestration. The present financial crisis is just the signal needed to restructure industries in Australia to become "green" - in fact our approach should be similar to a declaration of war on this issue. Our goal should be an absolute reduction in CO2 emissions by 2015-17 (not just a slowing down). By opting for this strategy, the nation would be heartened, united it would unleash all sorts of ideas, and would be supported by community commitment to achieve a goal which at present would be regarded as unachievable. Not to do so will leave community leaders frustrated and disappointed that the Rudd government did not have sufficient belief in itself to go ahead and make the necessary big changes.

D. John Hunwick

I am not at all interested in politics when it comes to common sense and emergencies. I consider the rapid rate of climate change (and it isn't like we don't have enough scientific evidence) an emergency, and urgent and meaningful action to slow down climate change just common sense. You as government have the power and responsibility to set an example and act. 5 to 15% is not enough. Please do more. Set the target between 30 - 40%. It may be hard for many to swallow in the short term but Australians will learn to accept this as the right thing to do.

Francine Seeto

We all know that PV (Photovoltaic) technology is being effectively utilised around the world, and that our great big slab of land is ideally placed to utilise this technology, right beneath a tropic.

Australia not only lies in the ideal position geographically to utilise the technology, but also has some of the worlds leading PV research facilities. Proper government funding should be pumped into both research (creating perfect green collar jobs) and implementation (note that unlike the ridiculous 'clean coal' phallacy, PV exists, and can actually be implemented now).

Even if the government refuses to make any realistic effort to help solar, they could at least stop actively hindering it by subsidising filthy fossil fuel powered generators, and redirect that money into our shameful health or education systems.

Seriously, it's a good idea.

Regards,

Michael Kelly

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

Australia should take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy, rather than prop up industries which are causing greenhouse gasses and pollution.

Under the Government's proposal the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will only make room for industry to increase their emissions.

Paul Hobson Camberwell Victoria 3124

To Whom it may Concern,

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!!!!

I believe the solution to this issue goes hand in hand with the solutions to the world's current economic crisis. To support greener and more sustainable ways of living is to create a solid economy.

Yours sincerely,
Michelle McCosker

The current targets and action on Climate Change are woefully inadequate. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020!

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.

I voted for Labour on a platform and election promise of strong action on climate change. I will now vote Green if no further action is taken.

Peter Norris

As a voter I am very disappointed by the government's current climate change policy. Greenhouse pollution targets of 5-15% are totally inadequate, especially given emerging evidence that climate change is happening more quickly than originally thought.

Low targets are also an embarrassment on the international scene, particularly as December's Copenhagen UN Conference on Climate Change approaches.

I also have serious misgivings about the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, which seems likely to make the situation worse rather than better.

I urge the government to provide inspirational leadership, both nationally and internationally, by giving serious consideration to a 50% reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution by 2020.

Margaret Ker

Dear Sir Madam,

I am writing to express my grave fears about the inaction the government is taking to tackle global warming. The Government is 'asleep at the wheel' here and should be ashamed of the legacy it will leave for future generations by their complicity. The planet is choking to death.

The passage of time enables us to look back on previous governments and assess their efforts. Future generations will not look back favourably on this pathetic effort to reduce emissions by our current elected officials.

Regards

Scott Drummond

Dear Senators

The currently proposed 5 to 15% target for greenhouse gas reduction is aiming far too low. I can understand caution because of the poor international financial situation, but this is a time for courage not caution.

We seem to be seeing much more ambitious targets set by the Europeans and possibly the US. I'd like us to strive to at least match the strongest of these. That's a strong bargaining chip. Anything less is surely letting down the side.

Thanks for listening

Terry

The Governments target of 5% is much lower than I would consider significant.
And the suggestion that world wide it should be 15% is similarly not high
enough.

Blythe Mann

I voted for the Labour government because of their promises on an aggressive approach to stopping climate change.

I believe the current CPRS is a danger to the successful fight against climate change.

I request the govt. to be far more active in legislating to slow climate change in a way that is functional and not political.

Jenny Morris

Australia's proposed greenhouse gas emission targets are woefully inadequate with no incentives for householders and businesses to reduce their emissions.

I will not vote for a political party that does not have meaningful targets.

Regards,
Mark Schneider

This is a chance for real action on climate change and the time is really running out fast. The Governments 5-15% target is a disgrace it falls far far short of what's needed. As others have suggested 50% cut by 2020 is good although even that maybe short of what is needed but at least it's a start. Labor came to power with promises of strong action on climate change but so far they have failed to live up to it.

Regards David Hirst

the govt seems to think we have a century to get this right but every day there is news that we need to act now and we need to act strongly. A policy designed to bring about change not just placate a few is what many australians would like there LEADERS strive for. We may all suffer for a while with stronger targets to achieve, but really we can't struggle at all if we are all dead from lack of will and LEADERSHIP

Sadhana

Hi,

It's time for some serious action on climate change. We need some strong targets - not 5%.

There are times where the economy is more important than a particular environmental issue, but this isn't one of them - if we lose some growth while redirecting our economy to be more sustainable, so be it.

We'll lose a lot more than just economic growth if climate change continues to accelerate.

We're running out of time, and need substantial action now.

If we commit to such a weak target, other nations will do so, too - and 15% is not enough internationally.

Please lift this target to something more like 50%

Thank you.
Julian Barton.

Dear Parliamentarian. I am extremely concerned about climate change. I do not feel that the proposed targets acknowledge the urgent need for change required to prevent our climate and environment from changing irreversibly. Scientists have identified so many 'tipping points' which can only be prevented by much stronger reductions than those proposed. I would like to see our country go to the UN conference on Climate Change a target of at least 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020 or better. Despite the fact that this will not be popular and the effects to the economy may be detrimental in the short term, surely this is preferable to the effects the worst climate prognatications will have if they eventuate.

I would like to see a scheme in place which changes our whole attitude to energy production and use. This does not include compensating the worst polluters to continue on their current course. IT means big expensive changes for everyone. We need strong leadership on this issue and we need it immediately.

Yours faithfully (and fearfully)
Trudy Rickard

Dear Senators,

I have never understood why a country like Australia, with our climate, is not leading the world in solar technology. Yet, in the midst of the debate about climate change, we're still talking about "clean coal" - a fundamental contradiction in terms and a prime example of greenwash - when we could be supporting a solar energy industry. Money for research and development, subsidies to households and businesses to install solar systems, and exporting our knowledge and technology around the world - they could be our future. Obviously, solar energy is not the whole answer to global warming and the ill-effects of dirty industries such as coal-fired power stations, but it's a good start.

Thank you for listening,
Rosemary Bruce

To whom it may concern,

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).

New scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much 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 important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

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

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

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

Please take a strong stance now!!!
Regards from a concerned Australian & Mother
Therese Dunn

Hello

I think the Australian government and community should be sincere about climate change and act to make cultural and technological change to plateau and reverse carbon emissions. Just this week we say a large ice plain the size of the Sydney basin break away from the Antarctic shelf exposing above water ice plain that when melted will raise sea levels.

As a parent I realise it will be our kids will be the recipients of our inaction and have to deal with the consequences of more extreme weather events, a less arable Australia and a greenhouse planet.

So if we can let's make a real difference otherwise there's no point.

Regards

Steve Thompson

Climate ? Heed the scientific evidence which has been mounting now for at least 15 years. Be bold ! Bite the bullet and set a lead world wide. The result of the current weak action on Climate Change will be visited at the door of you tte elected government. By the time you wake up the moment will have passed. And then who will get the blame, and will it matter anyway ?

What a sad lack of leadership within Australia and what an example for Australia to set the rest of the world. !.

RETHINK NOW PLEASE !

Warwick and antonia deacock

Hi there,

From almost every reliable study I've read, a target of 5-15% is completely, and utterly unacceptable. It completely flies in the face of all the climate research of the past 20 years. It not only will not only directly cause more harm to our planet, but will in turn lower the standard for Western and developing countries and their own climate targets.

I implore you, to please, reconsider this decision, and to adjust the targets to something more in line with the suggestions made by the UN and other International climate change entities.

Kind Regards,
Kane Rogers.

Please help Australia show how it can be done as Australia did with

1. A basic wage (since neutered)
2. Woemens suffrage (pity we were slow to recognise our indiginous siblings as human beings)

What could we do

1. Set challenging targets, not those demanded by sponsors of the major political parties
2. Pour all the GFC (Great Failure of Corporate management) mitigation into long term green projects.

Cheers

Tim

Dear Committee members,

Our 30 acre property has been powered by a free-standing solar powered system since 1989. The 11 year old house in which we now live was built as a model of passive solar design and as such was rated 4 1/2 stars under the then NatHers scheme. Over the years we have taken many small and some not so small steps in an effort to create a sustainable lifestyle.

Why should these efforts of ours and those of many of our neighbours count for no more than a means of compensating poluters at our expense??

While of profound importance, the current Global Finacial Crisis has also provided a convenient camouflage and a distraction from the making of tough decisions. What's the point of achieveing a healthy economy once again if there is no planet for it to operate within??

Yours sincerely

Hugh Ermacora

I am disappointed that more action on climate change has not been undertaken.

Predictions of significant increases in the height of sea levels and increased temperatures are now being tabled as conservative. The lack of action in the face of this is alarming, and the legacy and cost that shall be left for future generations is concerning.

A solution is needed on a global scale. As a developed nation and one of the worst polluters per capita I believe that Australia should be leading the solution by committing to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme places the onus on the community and the environment whilst the industrial polluters are not held to the same standards. A consequence of setting a weak target is that reductions made by small businesses and individuals will be offset by allowing large industry to increase their emissions whilst the limited cap is still being met.

Setting strong targets will also encourage innovation in industry and could, if managed properly, allow for more economic growth for the Australian economy by fostering renewable energy industries.

Please take action and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Long

Climate change is the the biggest problem we currently face. It also presents the biggest opportunity to create a better society than we have seen for many years.

A move away from fossil fuels to renewables will create many more jobs than will be lost, and they will be long-term sustainable jobs.

It needs bold vision to take advantage of the opportunities, but current government policy is weak and short sighted. The Australian people are ready for change, and need real leadership.

We need a much better target than the current pathetic 5% proposed.

The current CPRS proposal is hopelessly flawed and does very little to change the way big polluters do business. We need a scheme which really hurts the polluters, and really helps those reducing energy consumption and/or moving to renewable sources.

I care about my children, and the world they will have to bring their own children up in. Do you care enough to take real strong action on this issue?

Richard Chapman

To Whom It May Concern:

The current target of a 5 - 15% carbon dioxide emissions decrease is insignificant in the face of climate change and all scientific knowledge on this pheomena so far.

If Australia is serious about making a stand on climate change, we should commit to a 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020 (on 1990 levels). This will show the world that Australians are capable of putting words into action on important global issues. We require a serious, concerted global effort to help mitigate the effects of climate change, and Australia needs to lead by example.

At the next election, I will be putting my vote into the hands of a party that intends to take a real stand on climate change.

Kind regards,

-Liam Nolan.

We need to reduce our carbon emissions by 50% by 2020 to give the planet the best chance to stay below total disaster scenarios.

Australia's weak targets are undermining international agreements so we must scale our targets to a 50% reduction by 2020.

Our Carbon reduction scheme rewards polluters instead of encouraging them to reduce their emissions.

Stop rewarding the big polluters and instead reward sustainable clean technology like Solar and Thermal schemes.

Also we need to stop selling the "clean Coal" furore.

Clean Coal is as real as fairies at the bottom of the garden and the government needs to stop peddling such tripe.

Get on with supporting the real clean technologies now, before it is too late, this is an emergency for the planet.

Sincerely

Vicki Sullivan

Dear Senators,

I am writing to you to support stronger action on climate change than seems to be in evidence in the current legislation.

I have taken family initiatives to reduce my carbon footprint (1 kW PV cells, solar hot water, small diesel car) and am dismayed at the Govts poor attempt at supporting total carbon reduction.

It seems to me that big polluters have held sway in the debate so far in that they have attracted carbo offsets which totally negate the actions of those who act to reduce their emissions. It simply seems to swap responsibilities.

The big polluters have been on notice for some time and, as a community, we voted for and expect stronger (i.e. higher)reduction targets.

The legislation in its current form is toally inadequate in this regard!

Rob Ryan

Every month there is a new paper describing how climate change is happening than we thought. That means we have to increase our efforts to slow it down, not bury our heads deeper into the sand.

Graham Edgson

To whom it may concern,

I write to you as a citizen that believes the governments proposed 5% emission targets by 2020 are not at all sufficient to avoid the environmental and social of climate change.

Please do everything in your power to ensure Australia instead commits to reduce its emissions by at least 50% in this time.

New scientific evidence shows that climate change is affecting our world more quickly than we have ever thought. The Arctic summer ice is expected to melt completely within the next 5 years.

Please help to ensure Australia makes a stronger, effective commitment to sustaining life on this planet.

Sincerely,

Joseph S Brock

.

I think it apt to compare the Planet to Titanic. The unsinkable ship that sank. There is little doubt that we, the inhabitants of this planet have started a chain reaction that may be unstoppable. There needs to be a huge global effort to cut carbon emissions completely and capture carbon instead. The world has plenty of energy from the sun/wind/wave etc etc and the technology to utilise it. Instead we stand around posturing and talking while the ship sinks. You've probably heard the saying "Intelligence has boundaries, whereas stupidity has none". Lets get real here, look at the facts and and for once get serious. - Patrick Lane Craigmore South Australia

Dear Senators

I was shocked and ashamed when I first saw the proposal to set a target of 5% for Carbon Reduction by 2020. I believe it should be 20% at least, and the latest scientific data seem to suggest 50% would be preferable. I am deeply concerned that Australia seems determined to be a laggard rather than a leader.

Please stop making the excuse that jobs must be preserved. Please do not allow large corporations to have free permits to pollute given to them. They should buy them from the start.

We must rid ourselves of the belief that we can solve the climate crisis while simultaneously leading the same lifestyles as before. Our real choice is between a little pain now or a lot of pain later. That is true for the entire world.

Since the developed world has caused the greater part of the atmospheric pollution we are morally obliged to take on a greater part of the dislocation and hardship involved in making radical change.

Despite being on a very low income, a pension, I have still chosen to buy 100% GreenPower. I also drive about 15 km per week in a small car.

Others must begin to make whatever changes to their lifestyles as they are able and the government must have the strength of will to force behaviour change through financial mechanisms and other restrictions, because the goodwill of volunteers and the convinced will not be remotely sufficient to meet the crisis.

You have the power, vested in you by the people to make the changes that we as individuals cannot make.

I am aware of the arguments around trade exposed products and the small total contribution of Australia, but this is where true leadership goes beyond narrow self-interest.

Where we lead others will follow and those who would lag behind will be shamed into making stronger efforts. If we fail to act courageously the reverse effect will be facilitated.

Increasingly the public is ready to step up and take the medicine.

Yours with great goodwill
John Symond

Given the rate of climate change I'm very concerned about the low targets this government has committed to. I see this as the number one issue concerning the planet and it's vital for Australia to be working with the UN in a leadership capacity to address it.

We need to up our targets and commit to at least a reduction of 50% by 2020. The community should not be compensating for corporate polluters as the CPRS is currently suggesting.

Sincerely,
Deborah May

The Australian planned response to the accelerating damage that climate change is causing is inadequate. A target of 50% reduction by 2020 would provide a positive example to other countries and also some hope that the 2 degree warming maximum may be retained. As a rich country we should not shirk our responsibility to respond to this common challenge to humanity.

Charles Layton

We can't wait to act! I want to have something left to hand to my children (and hopefully grandchildren).

Unfortunately the damage has already been done. We can't let the destruction continue, and we have to pay the price today to ensure that we restore the environment for our future generations.

Don't hand back taxes - use them to fund solutions.

Don't pander to the polluters - they have to fall in line with corrective action.

Let's put a positive CPRS in place! Stop the rot!

Regards,

Jo-anne Jorgensen

The evidence is irrefutable, the consequences are terrifying and the time to act is now. The writing is on the wall and it's time that our leaders did what we elected them to do and lead! The current government won the election with one of it's most important and popular policies being their policy on climate change and it disgusts me to hear the pitiful commitment to reductions that the Rudd government has set. This just won't do. We all need to make sacrifices but the vast majority of us simply don't have the foresight to do it alone. We need government intervention and we need it now. Please, please, please govern us.

Scott Saunders.

Dear Senator

There is a lot of evidence that our world is exponentially and irreversibly being affected by climate change. Australia will be affected by climate change more than some other countries. Australia and Australians must act now not in years to come and the Government target at the moment is not good enough. As a wealthy western, educated country, we must lead and be up there with other top international targets and even show a leading role in reducing greenhouse pollution.

To me it seems that the Carbon Pollution scheme is not making industry as accountable as it should be. They need further supported enforcements to reduce their carbon emission schemes. This needs to be done NOW not later. Later is too late.

As well there needs to be further education and incentives for households and small business to encourage good practice in decreasing emissions.

Being kind to the earth and its environment will never go astray. A band-aid solution will not be able to deal with the matter in later years. 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.

Yours sincerely
Nicole Khedoori

Dear Sir/Madam,

Our company (Sinclair Knight Merz) is aiming to reduce our carbon footprint by 30% over 3 years. We take climate change very seriously and so do many other Australians. Already we are encountering the challenge such goals present but it will be well worth it if we hand over a functioning planet to our kids. It will be REALLY disappointing if weak climate change targets agreed by our politicians compromise our hard work and sacrifice.

Regards,

John French

A major effort should be made to establish several forms of renewable energy. It is most important that these industries be promoted urgently. If there are not enough sources to provide base load requirements and "hot rocks" is a possible contender for this role, I would advocate nuclear power to fill this purpose. The handling of nuclear waste is not a problem in my opinion.

Clean coal is a contradiction in terms and I think that sequestration of carbon dioxide will be expensive if it is ever achieved and the permanence of its containment is most uncertain. It would be better stored as a chemical compound which if chosen carefully could be the basis of an industry. Coal could be more valuable as a source of complex chemicals than being burnt for a source of heat.

John McLennan

The proposed scheme is hopelessly inadequate.
It appears to be no more than a token attempt to deal with climate change. It is not what we expected when we voted for a labor government.

Let us see some serious proposal.

Walter and Patricia Phillips

The proposed targets need to be increased 50% of 1990 levels by 2020 is terribly inadequate

The current scheme seems on the face of it to

Benefit polluters rather than forcing them to significantly change their business models. Why would you reject the opportunity to massively increase our economic capacity by reinventing Aust business? This is your chance to make it happen so take it!

Kind regards

Mark

There isn't time to diddle daddle with 5-15% targets. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). There is too much evidence now showing the impact climate change is having on our world. We should be setting a global example using a strong target and a well designed scheme as our contribution to reducing climate change.

Focus should be on renewable energies, new growth industries which will provide additional jobs to Australians who would be proud to work in such an area.

Where is the leadership? Do not let us down - we voted for you and you have an obligation to the people of Australia and the world to set an example and make us proud.

Rebecca Davis
Camperdown

To Whom It May Concern:

The current target of 5%-15% reductions in greenhouse gas emissions is just not good enough. Not only is it not good enough in terms of the necessary cuts to prevent catastrophic climate change, but it also completely undersells Australia's ability to be a world leader in renewable energy.

The weakness of these reductions is based on a fallacy - that deep cuts will be harmful to Australian business. The fact is that sooner or later a change must be made to the way we generate and use energy. Delaying that change is like delaying dealing with termites in a building. You can either fix the problem now or wait until the house falls down and try to fix the problem then, at much, much greater expense and hardship.

The technology exists now to replace fossil fuels for power generation. Australia has a huge opportunity to build an export market in such technology, which will be in massive demand worldwide over the next decade. An integrated programme of investment, public/private partnership, training and retraining, and international cooperation would see Australia's industry forge ahead instead of falling behind, as would be inevitable with the current embracing of the status quo.

These targets represent a "fiddling while Rome burns" approach. A more ambitious set of targets is required (and will benefit Australia both financially and environmentally), as is a cap-and-trade system that properly incentivises both large and small business, public and private organisations and individuals to make improvements in efficiency.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission.

Kind regards,
Michael Pollitt.

The current target of 5-15% in pollution cuts is inadequate and an international signal of a non-action country. Australia should be leading the reduction on emissions and building a strong industry of environment friendly/renewable energy suppliers.

brendan shelper

Stop hiding your head in the sand!!! What will it take to make you see and respond in a responsible way? I know there is no money to be made, but let me tell you, there are a lot of voters out here who are getting very angry and will be paying you by changing their vote!!! If you can't take the heat(guess what? you will be frying in it before you know it) We have some of the worlds finest scientists so HELLO! why don't you listen to them.

5-15% will only represent one of those grains of sand that you currently have your head buried in.

Australia's greenhouse pollution MUST be reduced 50% by 2020 (1990 levels)or the world as we know it will not be what our children and their children will experience.

So PLEASE forget your petty little political games and get serious before it is too late for all of us!

Noels Benson

The government is not showing that they are committed to reducing the impact of climate change by only setting a low target of 5-15% reduction. Australia is in a good position to lead the way. The people of Australia (and the world) want a future for our children and grandchildren. Act now, before its too late.

Robyn Jeffrey

Hello,

Everyone knows that the Krudd Labor Government is doing a hopeless job. Their administration has been the biggest waste of time in Australian history. Please, for the sake of Australia and the world, make a strong push for higher climate targets. Please do not let these four years be a total waste of time and money.

Thank you,
Iain Cooper

According to scientific findings, a reduction of 5% to 15% in carbon emissions by 2020 is insufficient to prevent dangerous climate change. For example the Arctic ice melt rate is dangerously high and could cause the extinction of the polar bear. More realistic is 50%. Also there is no point taking away permission to pollute with one hand and giving it back with the other, i.e. providing companies with free carbon credits.

Environmentally friendly energy technology development must be encouraged. This includes wind energy, wave energy, solar energy and hydrogen fuel. Biochemical energy should be considered but keep in mind that it could impact on the food supply. Nuclear energy is not a viable option as it poses dangerous problems in waste disposal and monitoring especially for future generations. Those problems could be just as dangerous as the greenhouse effect.

Of course reduction in the use of energy should be encouraged. With the advent of the Internet, working at home for many is more efficient than it used to be. Governments should encourage use of the Internet to reduce travelling and should not interfere unduly with its use. The Internet is for everyone, not just legislators and government officials. Wars and military action also are bad for the environment and must be drastically reduced, preferably eliminated.

Frank Pacey

I voted for the Rudd Government because I believed it was serious about leading Australia into an environmentally-friendly future.

So far I've heard nothing but (muted) sound and (tepid) fury signifying nothing.

The problems are not going to go away. Until you who can change our culture to a workable economic system based on an ethic of consuming only renewable resources do so, we're up that well-known (bone-dry) creek..

Is it really so difficult to put cells on Government buildings? to treat electricity as though it costs the earth? to use the massive purchasing power of the Commonwealth Government to support zero-emission vehicles? to continue subsidies for households installing p.e. cells? to pressure electricity suppliers to buy from suppliers at a rate higher than their selling price?

Is it possible just once to have a Government that does not fulfill the age-old wisdom that pie-crusts and politicians promises are made to be broken?

Diana Day

To Penny Wong

I am writing to you to alert you to the fact that I am very unhappy about the Government's 5-15% target. It is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. I believe that we should instead commit to reducing Australian's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (and base that on 1990 levels).

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

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

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

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 writing this letter in the hope that you will take my view seriously as this is a very serious issue.

Sincerely
Lauretta Rowsell

The government's policy on reducing greenhouse emissions will not do anything to mitigate climate change. It is woefully inadequate. This government, instead of learning from the mistakes made by European countries, is copying those mistakes. To turn climate change around, the target for reducing emissions should be 50% by 2020, not a ridiculous 5%.

Barack Obama is setting more sensible targets - how sad that our prime minister didn't have the courage to do so after the Garnaut report was published.

Polluters have to learn to use the technology available to stop them from polluting. As it is, the community is working hard, and making sacrifices (I've just spent \$24 000 on solar panels, not for gain, but to help future generations)while industry is being cosseted by a weak prime minister.For heaven's sake, Mr Rudd, show some strong leadership!

I really have no hope for the world, as the people who could have made a difference just don't have the guts.

Sue Bradbury

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my displeasure at hearing that Australia will only be contributing between 5-15% cuts in our emissions based on 1990 levels. I realize that Australia has an economy which is carbon-intensive, however i believe that the scientific consensus is that we (and other states) need to make bigger cuts in our greenhouse gas emissions in order to tackle this global phenomenon.

I also realize that there will be a cost to Australia in terms of jobs lots, as businesses incur additional costs under a Carbon Cap and Trade Scheme. This is a cost which Australia will simply have to bear. The economic impact of committing to deeper cuts in our emissions could be offset by jobs created in green energy sectors, which Australia needs to seriously consider being at the forefront of to ensure our continued economic viability.

Set stronger targets
I will be voting on this issue.

Regards,
Kieren

Dear Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy,

The Government's climate policy does not seem adequate.

I believe Australia's commitment to climate issues needs to be stronger. We need a target much stronger than 5-15% to make a real difference. Australia needs to be an international leader, and work with other countries to reduce climate change.

There need to be tactics to facilitate growth in industries that will contribute to environmental sustainability, such as renewable energy.

Thank you for your time.

Kate Ferguson

To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my sincere concern with the current reduction target for Australia's greenhouse gases. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, Australia was thought of around the world as something of an environmental pioneer. Particularly work against whaling and the non proliferation of CFCs harmful to the Ozone layer suggested to the world that Australia was forward thinking and prepared to stand up on issues important to us all.

Unfortunately, from 1996 onwards environmental issues were put on the backburner to say the least, and Australia slipped from being a world leader in something to lurking right at the back of the pack. I think it is vital, not only for our future environmental, political and economic security, but also for our current international relations that Australia at the very least keeps up with the major players on issues of climate change. With Europe so heavily on board, Australia is perfectly placed to mediate between the old world, and the new

Asian giants on the rise over the issue of environmental protection. But this mediation can only arise if Australia itself takes a strong position on climate change-how can we ask the rest of the world to do what we refuse to? The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) as currently proposed threatens to do more harm than good. We cannot continue in the same hyper-consuming fashion as we have hitherto. By over compensating those who are polluting the most, there will be no change in pollution levels or consumption and therefore no change at all.

Please review both the Scheme and the targets. Australia has a chance to stand up and contribute to a climate change solution, please let us take it!

Thank you for your time,

Amelia Cole

I look back into the past 10 years of my life and I see a dramatic climate change. This summer was really depressing when Melbourne had the hottest summer on record. Trees are dying at a rate I have never seen before. For the first time I see hundreds of leaves falling off trees in Summer. This is due to the weather being too hot for them to survive. On one occasion this year everyone needed to leave work early due to the fear of stormy winds which were going to arrive later in the afternoon. This is the first time that has happened. I am 41 years old. This type of weather has never happened before. This means the weather is changing. This makes me scared and apprehensive about the future weather. Especially because I perceive the Government is doing nothing to stop the climate from changing. The Government is doing nothing. I feel very anxious. The weather is changing dramatically.

Regards

Marion

To the Senate,

Thank goodness you exist to prevent outrageously unacceptable schemes such as the Government's Carbon Reduction Scheme from going ahead.

Please do not give this the go-ahead, for all reasons under the wonderful sun.

There are graduates galore in renewable energies who are forced to go abroad. There are nations shaking their heads at us. There are so many reasons this scheme should be sent back to the drawing board.

Millions of jobs could be created by establishing industries and greening existing industries in order to reach a target of 50% by 2020. Millions of tanks, thousands of solar panels could be installed and individuals could feel a sense of power and satisfaction by being assisted to make changes.

How can the Government be acting on behalf of Australia when efforts by the ordinary Australian are suffocated?

Voters are increasingly demanding that action be taken, and with climate change being the top issue of a young generation there will need to be a major change of attitude on this issue.

There has been a HUGE outcry on this issue by the people, and big industries represent themselves, not the people.

Please do not say yes to the scheme. The public are not stupid and they don't buy being told it's 'in their interests' or that 'it's the best that can be done'.

It's not the best. Surely the Greens agree with this. Surely the Liberals know that it is flawed and incredibly weak.

Who would want to govern over a country whose reef is white and lifeless? Whose rivers are dry and whose rugged beauty is increasingly ravaged by fires?

This is ultimately what has to be prevented, and the Senate has the power to prevent that now.

Regards,

Aimee Burslem.

Please make Australia a leader on climate change policy, not a follower.
Commit Australia to reducing greenhouse gas emission by 50% on 1990 levels by
2020, a target that is needed stop global warming, and the ultimate
destruction of our planet. This is life and death stuff.
Alan

I voted Labor in the last election believing that if elected the Labor government would work to make a significant cut in greenhouse gases in Australia. I was terribly disappointed to find it is only proposing a 2020 cut of only 5 to 15 percent cut. This is a paltry amount and if other countries follow this lead the world is in dire straits. You have got to do better!

Gordon Dicker

Climate Change on the earth we all share is not just conjecture anymore but a fact.

I am concerned that if this government doesn't make strong commitments to the reduction of greenhouse gases now, it will continually be put off - what will the point be to all this procrastinating if there is no earth to live in? We have to think of our children's and grandchildren's futures. What answers can we give them when they ask us why is it that they can only know of a beautiful earth through images of the past?

Please be brave and act ethically and with integrity to your fellow humans not only for now but for the future.

I hope and pray that the right thing for the health of our planet will be done by all.

T. Ilander

It is said that "money is the root of all evil"... but I would say to you that 'complacency' might fit the bill better.

We have to stop worrying about the costs and impositions, and act now.

If we turn a blind eye, we will see a new crises in the near future... Just like the financial crises, which was warned about for years but ignored because of complacency.

Peace and Love

Marina

Dear Madam/Sir,

Australia can do better than only 5-15% target for greenhouse pollution. Climate change is undeniably happening much quicker than previously thought, displayed only recently in the Antarctic.

Instead of active measures Australia is allowing big polluters to bail themselves out of their duty using the carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

A strong target would encourage new industries in renewable energy to develop and help the economy.

The Australian population is ready to do their bit.

Green energy is still more expensive for a private household. Solar power is not encouraged by incentives to feed it back into the grid. Other countries are not just having one Earth Hour per year but switching off all lights after a certain time every night. We would love to use our bicycles much more if it would be safer than on a narrow road pushed to the edge by cars. We also would love to get solar hot water and a water tank established but as a tenant such expenses are too high in case we have to move.

There was so much money available to bail out banks for bad management and wrong investment during the financial crisis, which could have helped tackling climate change or world hunger.

Best regards

Dorte Planert

Dear Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I am extremely concerned about the progress that has not been made in the area of climate change in Australian Government policy. It is patently obvious, even to a lay observer, that the proposed reductions targets are grossly inadequate. Most disturbing is that industry is piggy-backing on the goodwill of the Australian people who, concerned to do their bit and pull their weight, are installing PV panels and solar hot water services in their homes only to find that by selling their RECs all they are doing is selling indulgences to those who are going to continue to produce greenhouse pollution at the same or similar rates. In fact, as someone who is currently exploring the possibility of installing PV panels I am all but put off because of the perversity of the system that has been constructed.

It is not good enough. There is too much persuasive scientific evidence for us to sit idly by and wait for someone else in the world to take a strong leadership role before we follow on like sheep; or more aptly, lambs to the slaughter. Given our astonishingly poor per capita record in greenhouse gas emissions, surely we have an obligation to punch above our weight on this important issue.

Please, please, please take this issue seriously - for our children's sake, and for their children's sake.

Yours faithfully,

Eve Lester

Don't back down on climate change. We have to do our bit and show the world how it's done. Don't let the unions scare you - if they truly cared about their members they'd be working hard to get them cross trained into enviro-friendly roles. They'd be lobbying government to get wind, ocean & solar systems set up. Instead, they're terrified that going green will mean laid off workers which means no more money & power for the unions.

Well guess what, it's happening already. Even without the eco-changes, people are being laid off. So, bite the bullet and do it right. Go hard and be the government that's remembered as having the balls to do what was necessary at the time.

Cheers,

Grant

Come on guys, we all have to pull and hurt together on this. We need serious cuts on emissions and we need them soon. Climate change is hotting up according to the science, and if strong action is not taken now it will be too late to preserve the world as we know it. Stop listening to short sighted and self-interested business and industry lobbyists and start looking at some reality, because pretty soon reality is going to be looking at us. Effective climate change action please.

Julie Squire

Having just rewatched Al Gore's An Inconvenient Truth, the first news story I saw revealed that the antarctic ice shelves are breaking off at a much faster rate than even two years ago when the documentary was made. The Australian Governement needs to recognise that the weak targets it is setting could lead to distasterous consequences far sooner than expected.

We need to commit to reducing green pollution by 50% by 2020 or I face the possibility that my house may be under water within my lifetime.

Nathan Etherington

I believe the governments 5-15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Please consider increasing targets to a 50% reduction of greenhouse pollution by 2020.

Bronwyn Hollett

This is a historic time when we need to take a long view. Financial crises come & go but carbon in the atmosphere is making irreversible changes.

Please have the courage to look after future generations.

A target around 20% down on 1990 levels by 2020 is difficult but we can do it. Such a robust target would give us better status in international discussions where vital decisions will be made.

Do what is good for the whole globe.

Ros Lewis, Launceston, Tas.

Appropriate action now is crucial to the long term viability of our country and our world.

Please consider strengthening Australia's climate change targets over those currently suggested. If we are to have any chance of avoiding the failure of crucial ecosystems over the next hundreds of years we must make meaningful progress now.

We have enjoyed the benefits without considering the consequences for too long and, regardless of the current global financial situation, should not miss out on this opportunity to make a positive impact on climate change and our sustainability.

A little bit of pain now will have a massive impact for the world future generations will inherit.

Thank you.
Tom John.

I am writing to urge you to increase Australia's targets for reducing greenhouse gas. The proposed targets are simply inadequate to avoid dangerous and irreversible climate change.

In addition, the proposed scheme negates any efforts by individuals to reduce their emissions, by allowing pollution is to benefit from them. It reduces motivation amongst individuals to do things such as use solar power, use public transport etc.

Yours sincerely,

Lee O'Mahoney

To Whom It May Concern

I wish to object to the inadequately low target set by the Government to reduce carbon emissions. I also object to the slant of policies focussing away from individual action. In particular I request the Government to look at introducing a scheme which includes gross feed in tariffs. This would stimulate the solar industry, creating more jobs, and it would encourage individuals to invest in clean energy.

I also object to the excessive compensation for high carbon emission industries at the expense of individual and community based projects.

I urge you to change the focus and extent of the proposed scheme.

Thank you

Anne Carson

Climate change is happening there is no doubt. Surely no more than the current evidence is necessary to convince you that stronger measures are necessary than presently being planned.

As a concerned citizen I implore you, the government of Australia to act quickly and much more decisively.

Yours faithfully,

Ruth Beasley

I am deeply disturbed by the Rudd Government's inadequate targets for greenhouse gas emission in this country, and very concerned by the apparent capitulation to big CO2 emitting business in the CPRS. I am also very worried that the current draft of the legislation appears to indicate that the polluters get a free ride on the backs of individuals who wish to take their own initiatives to reduce CO2 emissions, be it by paying a premium for green energy, or by installing energy saving or generating devices. This undermines any sort of collective ownership of the issue and makes it a problem for "them" to deal with , and not fur us as a country.

Stephen Rogerson

Dear Committee Members

the Governments target of 5% reduction of Greenhouse Emissions is inadequate. A reduction of at least 75% of 1990 levels should be the target. This should then achieve at least 25%reduction. With a serious target, new industries and jobs will be created that will more than offset losses in polluting industries. Any scheme should not allow creators of pollution to continue to do so but have incentives to reduce their impact on climate change.

Thankyou

John Toshach

Like many thousands of Australians I am bitterly disappointed that the government has set such low targets on reduction of carbon emissions.

It is no longer just our grandchildren's world which is threatened; dramatic and perhaps irreversible climate change is already upon us.

Please do not embed the soft option. Australia can and should be a world leader in this area.

Bruce Fairfax, MACE, MACEL

The current design of the CPRS contains major flaws that need rectifying before passing into legislation.

there is no environmental or economic justification for compensating or subsidising the coal industry or the electricity generators. the compensation should not be given

there is no justification for the free allocation of permits to any industry. All permits must be auctioned

the provision for buying international credits must be withdrawn. reductions in GHG emissions must happen within Australia. other mechanisms are far more appropriate for protecting forests on a global scale

australia's target is completely inappropriate with the scale and urgency of responding to climate disruption. A 40% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020 is the minimum acceptable target.

Australia has huge potential for energy efficiency. Low cost energy savings remain untapped domestically.

Australia has huge potential to develop a range of currently proven renewable technologies.

Patrick Hodder

To the Australian Parliament:

I wish to express my dismay at the seeming lack of action in reducing harmful pollution. While it is widely held to be true that gaseous emissions cause climate change, I actually feel that this is secondary to the negative direct impact that pollution has on the health of the planet and all its organisms and biosystems.

It is long past time to eliminate most of the harmful chemicals from our air, water and food, as well as our manufactured goods. We must reduce far more than a token 5% or even 15% of polluting factors from our environment.

Industrially-based 'experts' may vow that their emissions or products are safe for the environment - whether drugs or gasses - but independent studies have uncovered alarmingly harmful effects of many substances from GM foods and crops to diesel truck particulates to electro-magnetic pollution. The rapidly escalating health crises and sterility afflicting the human and animal species of Earth should attest to the fact that our poisoned environment is harming us.

I would urge Parliament to immediately act to restrict pollution. With respect to industrial emissions, I KNOW [as a former industrial draughtswoman] that it is quite possible to 'scrub' the toxins out of emissions. Yes, it costs the company more, but do the corporate members of society not breathe the same air as their workers? Excessive focus on profit-making has become extremely harmful to society and world health in that it leads to corner-cutting with regard to public safety.

It is hard of course for Parliament to know where to begin to redress such vast damage as we now suffer, but almost anywhere is suitable in that true action would send a signal to the other countries of the world that at least one entity is taking action. Intentions and future plans are just not enough.

I would also urge to Parliament to avoid the linking of taxes to the cleaning of the environment. Taxes are paid by the 'man in the street' - merely a punitive measure that enables the polluters to continue their ways without restraint.

The ONE thing that we need is REDUCTION of pollution NOW - a physical, not a fiscal, measure.

Thank you for your attention.

Jeannette Lewis

I was disappointed at pretty much every piece of news the government has come out with about what they are going to do about climate change in Australia. We have the technology, we have the people willing to pay for it, we have a need for it... Do it. There's no reason Australia can't meet this 50% cut by 2020 everyone is asking for. Give it to us.

I'm no politician, and I don't plan to be. But of those who are your job is to listen to the public and supply what they ask for.. Start doing your job.

Regards,
Thomas Paine.

I was struck by Rupert Murdoch's line in his speech for the ABC's Boyer lectures when he said "I don't believe in the apocalyptic images of climate change, but I do believe we should give the planet the benefit of the doubt".

As an Aussie citizen, I'm willing to change my lifestyle so as to help the nation aim for better climate reduction goals than 5%. News about things happening faster than anticipated scares me - I know that's part of the tactic, but the facts do seem to point to a pretty stark reality.

Maybe it's seasonal, maybe this comes around every couple of centuries, but I still don't reckon we should be letting it just go by without working hard to slow it down. I want to see my government put a strong stance forward that the rest of the world can be inspired by, the current goal is just not enough and I agree with commentators that suggest we're undermining a global effort.

Let's set ourselves a strong challenge rather than cop out and live for today only. Set the target at 50%.

Thanks for your time,
Rory Chambers

PLEASE take another look at the present approach to tackling our earth's most urgent problem.

PLEASE act more aggressively in order to be effective.

PLEASE don't put money concerns ahead of climate change schemes.

You just don't have time to continue mucking around.

Sincerely

Sue Schauer

Senate Select Comm on Climate Policy,

1. Climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought so a stronger response is necessary.

2. The Government's present target is totally inadequate to deal with this and must be changed.

3. The CPRS is badly designed and overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

again the people have been Duded or should I say Ruded.

sincerely yours

Ben Aldridge

Folks, it's easy to forget the environment when we are surrounded by so many shiny trinkets.

My grandchildren are too young to know what sort of a world surrounds them, but their time will come.

I don't wish to feel any shame for what we have left them.

Please set some real targets that will give our planet some sort of a chance.

Sincerely,

Dave Groves

I do my best to reduce our families carbon footprint but the governments proposed CPRS is going to nullify all that we do beyond a 5 to 15 % target . It means I'm going to be less committed to the cause because it may not make any difference . There needs to be no floor beyond which emissions cannot fall or there needs to be a target in the vicinity of 50% . I'm prepared to do what it takes at a family level but only if I see results . What I want is climate change policy that is broad in spectrum and sets a strong target , let's show the world what we can do .

Thanks

Rob

Dear Senators

I call on the emissions reduction targets to be greatly tightened. I object strongly to the concessions to heavily polluting industries currently in the draught ETS - such concessions crush all incentive for the innovation, both technological and societal, so desperately needed to overcome the threat of global warming from human-emitted CO2 emissions. This is the greatest threat that our species' survival has ever dealt with. Moreover, in the current worsening economic climate, new industrial opportunities are desperately needed. I believe industries arising from the supply of renewable energy, the massive construction of public transport and other infrastructure needed to achieve worthwhile targets will yield these industrial opportunities. Australia is gearing up to miss out on these industries, just as other technology manufacturing have passed us by in the past.

Sincerely

Rod Vance

Today I saw on the news the rate the ice is melting in both the north and south poles. It's alarming and we, the human race are the cause.

Mother Earth is screaming for our help - she is showing signs all over the world that she is in serious trouble. From high pollution, to odd climate and seasonal changes, to ice melting, ozone hole, etc.

We, the people, are responsible. There's so much each household can do, but it falls more on the government and industry standards that will bring about the larger change.

Continuing the way we are - we are already seeing the evidence of the consequences. How more stupid do we have to be before we come to our senses and do something dramatic about it? By 2020 Australia could be under water from the south pole - have you considered that?

Do you want to be a government looking back from 2020 saying what have we done (ie. if you're still alive)? Or do you want to be a government standing tall and saying "we have made a difference to the millions of people in Australia and around the world? We took action, and Mother Earth is happy now."

Connect with your heart. Connect to your children and your grandchildren and find the answers within. 5-15% is coming from power and money and that's useless to Mother Earth and it's people, animals and natural resources.

Make us proud Mr Rudd - Do the Right Thing!!! It's time to clean up our rubbish - all forms and start protecting our beloved Mother Earth and everything that lives in and around it.

Thank you
Mara Dower

Why is it that individual behavioural changes will simply be absorbed as free permits for big polluters.

Why will using less electricity which would normally lead to less demand and less profit for power generators just mean that power generators have extra permits to sell.

Wake up, create a policy that allows people to be part of the change. Don't cap our emissions at any % why create a ceiling if there is capacity to do more and the damage to our economy isn't as much as the media has drummed away!

Please consider our economy! Australia will soon be nothing but a service based industry, we should be getting worried!

We are letting foreign countries buy into companies who control our wealth (minerals). So picture the future, no manufacturing, not much R&D, and commodities owned by foreign countries.

With a weaker dollar, crappy share market we are allowing foreign companies to buy into our nations wealth. Why are we so stupid, wake up you monkeys!

Regards,
Someone who cares, and wishes you did too.
Alex Surace

The amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere has increased, due to human activity, by about 50%, despite all the buffering mechanisms on the planet, such as greater uptake by plants due to accelerated growth rates. It is reasonable to assume that much of the buffering capacity has already been taken up.

If this is so, and CO₂ has increased 50%, what is the possible use of trying to reduce this enhanced CO₂ level by a mere 5%, or even 15%. Such a feeble effort is laughable!

The analysis of climatic change must obviously never be up-to date regarding the latest scientific data. It is terrifying to see that as new data arrive, the situation revealed is almost always WORSE than expected, due to the existence of factors not yet understood or quantified.

It is claimed that a larger target will impact adversely on industry and increase costs. Yes. This is the purpose of any CO₂ reduction scheme, to make it uneconomic to continue with our present programs.

In the present economically stressed conditions, reductions in employment and production will deliver a great reduction in greenhouse gas production without any scheme to do so. In fact, a 5% reduction will probably occur if no-one does anything differently. This is a total cop-out on the part of our government, when other countries such as Germany are acting decisively, looking forward to a world with less CO₂ production, and filling the employment gap with greenhouse-effective training and work programs.

Wake up to reality. Please.

Dr John Holmes, B.A., M.V.Sc., Ph.D

The Government is not acting adequately to combat climate change.

By 2020 our greenhouse pollution should be reduced by 50%. Our planet is in danger and we must all do our best to preserve it fully.

The Government must take appropriate action and take a tougher stand on climate change.

Thanks

Marianne Wallace-Crabbe

Hi Government,
the 5-15% target in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is not adequate. We
need maybe as high as a 50% reduction.
Paul Wadsworth

Dear Australian legislators and advisers,

Your constituents are calling and you really need to listen. We're the people who vote, and this is supposed to be a democracy. We're the parents and grandparents who want you to act now to ensure that our children and their children have a safe and healthy environment to live in. This is more important than the temporary interests of a small handful who want to make as much money as they can and let all of us bear the consequences.

The targets set by the Australian government so far to reduce greenhouse emissions are unrealistically soft. At a time when the world is looking to the biggest per capita polluters (like Australia) for leadership, that's what we need to provide. At a time when all the news on polar meltings and other symptoms are screaming for stronger action, this is not a time for weakness and short-sightedness. At a time when economies are struggling, we need to build a future on sustainable energy and not fall behind the world leaders.

For goodness sake, will you please tell the big polluters to go jump and do what we elected you to do: a 50% reduction by 2020, please.

Yours sincerely,
Stafford Sanders

Come on Kevin and Co.....GET SERIOUS !!!!!

Get Serious and help Australia as a Nation take a Lead Role in establishing a World-Wide benchmark for climate change across the board.

Lets take the lead in establishing and promoting these benchmarks and lets actually live by them !

Let's also develop new policy to help establish and guide small businesses that can drive peoples attitudes to climate change so something real actually happens !

Living in Hope,

Damion.

I believe it is vital to have a CPRS now, NOT wait because of the financial situation. This is too important to delay - our children and grandchildren are at risk.

The Government's scheme needs amending, especially in regard to a target higher than 15% and one which gives incentives to individuals and communities to reduce their carbon outputs. The community is ahead of the government on this issue. The Opposition should not hold up the scheme and the Greens should compromise so that the scheme can go ahead even if not perfect. Once it is in place it can be amended later.

(Mrs) Iola Mathews, Melbourne.

To whome it may concern,

I am very disappointed at the current E.T.S put before us by the Rudd government, although I am happy with most of their other decisions, this one is way off the mark. We need to set the example for other nations to follow, we should be at the forefront of climate policy and green power. Frankly, at 5% it's not worth the paper it's written on and will do nothing to help our precious planet. The people of Australia are well and truly ready for large cuts in greenhouse emissions, it's business and government who are afraid of the sky falling in. If we fail to act however, then the sky will indeed fall in.

We need/require/want a 50% cut in greenhouse emissions (1990 levels) by 2020 WHAT EVER IT TAKES. No more games or halfheartedness, this is our ONLY chance to continue the human species on this planet. Don't hand it over to the cockroaches please.

Regards

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please increase your targets for emissions reductions to 40%. The current targets are too low in light of what's happening in Antarctica and if Australia is to show some global leadership.

Sincerely

Roger Grealy

To whom it may concern,

It appears that there are a number of studies that call for big reductions in Greenhouse Emissions. The Government's 5-15% target is far from the recommended targets to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

I am aslo EXTREAMLY concerned about the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government. The scheme takes the power out of the individuals hands. All the efforts that myself and others make to reduce our footprint fuels the carbon emissions of industry. As I have worked hard to reduce my impact, this scheme takes away the power of the individual. I say NO WAY is that fair or democratic.

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.

Cheers,
Ben Maron

The emissions target [$<15\%$] is so weak that one can only conclude that the gov't is not sincere.

Just this week another vast Antarctic ice-shelf collapsed - Hello? Anybody noticing this wake-up alarm? Not Ms Wong , evidently!

Where is all the action we were promised before the federal election?

The gov't needs to get real and stop bending over for the coal lobby.

I have installed a solar HWS and PV array; walk, cycle and use PT rather than drive - I am infuriated that my efforts will have been in vain if the gov't's CPRS gets up!

NO more political expediency! We need sincere action, urgently!

Faithfully
Gray Ardern

Australia's commitment to a 5% carbon reduction is embarrassing. 100% renewable energy by 2050 is needed. Climate change is happening too rapidly to dither.

Divide Australia's carbon quota amongst its citizens. Allow them to spend their carbon quota (or not) as they see fit. Insist that business buys carbon a quota for (eg) its private jet - before it takes off.

Every consumer purchase must carry the full cost of carbon embedded in the product. Those who live a modest low-carbon lifestyle will have carbon quota for sale.

Carbon Market signals should be loud and clear and directly related to pollution, for product producers, as well as consumers. A border adjustment can be made for international trade with countries who do not participate in such a scheme. Ignore the screams of the ultra-capitalist WTO, their days of encouraging corporations to externalise their global environmental harm are numbered.

Australia's proposed Carbon Pollution reduction scheme is undemocratic, ill-informed, biased towards corporate 'business as usual'. It will do more harm than good. Carbon reduction is a zero sum game. The more carbon credits given to (eg) Aluminium smelter owners, the fewer there will be for (eg) renewable energy infrastructure.

Let the people decide what goods and services are worth their carbon cost.

Citizens must be given the opportunity to participate in this economic reorganisation. It is offensive that any individual reduction in carbon pollution by the population at large will benefit only the corporate sector, by suppressing their cost of carbon. Given an appropriate allocation for health, education and community infrastructure, Individual citizens should be free to choose which part of their carbon lifestyle is important to them.

Deidrie Jinks

We should be working towards zero emissions as fast as we can go because the climate is changing faster than all the experts predicted. Furthermore green jobs can be created

Dr James Hansen, the world's leading climate scientist, has asserted that to avoid dangerous climate tipping points, we need to stabilize the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at between 300 and 350 parts per million CO₂, far below the levels of 450- 550 ppm considered in the terms of reference in the Garnaut report. We have to keep emissions below 350 ppm or we increase the severe weather events and eventually leave many millions of people homeless.

Surely it not hard to understand this is a crisis greater than the financial crisis The government needs to declare an emergency and work faster and smarter than it is now.

For Penny Wong to say that this weeks events in the Antarctic are wake up call to sceptics is a joke She is acting liking a sceptic with a totally inadequate target of 5-15% Further more letting teh biggest poluters off the hook is undermining the improvements being made by individuals and some businesses. Teh governemnts weak response to this unfolding crisis is extremely disappointing. Its not how I expected to them to handle this critical issue.

Helen van den Berg

This whole scheme is a monumental con-job. It will not do a thing to reduce Australia's carbon dioxide emissions. I've looked into it (following the recent revelations by Guy Pearce), and decided not to go ahead with getting solar panels on my roof, because all it will do is cost me money (due to the Victorian Government's disappointing arrangements for the premium feed-in tariff), and allow the big polluters to use my credits.

When is the government going to get real, and put some serious and genuine reduction targets in place?

Disgustedly yours
Rosemary Sceats

Dear senators

w we ask you to pressure the government to re think the targets set by them and at the same time get the opposition to stand up as well instead of all the hot air that they are macking on this subject

Surely with all the new types of systems that are available today money should be spent on getting these online instead of further studies that get no where
David Mather

I am concerned that the Government's target of 5-15% is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. I understand that Government does not want to economically disadvantage Australia in a global market, but am of the view that if catastrophic climate change occurs, we will all be severely disadvantaged, so we should take a lead on this important issue, in the hope that other countries will follow suit.

The research continues to pile evidence in front of us that climate change is happening more quickly than previously thought, so now is the time for decisive action.

We can also gain great economic advantage by positioning ourselves as a green economy, using innovation and design to come up with the next wave of products to overcome our reliance on dirty energy.

I feel strongly that the CPRS in its current form does not encourage polluters to stop; rather it is individuals who will make sacrifices and those credits will potentially be bought by polluters who make no changes at all.

I look forward to your response.

Regards,
Cristy Dieckmann

To whom this may concern:

The Australian Government is failing to take steps to secure a healthy future both for the people that live in Australia and our environment. We are also being poor global neighbours to other countries to. As our failure to adequately address our green house emissions will impact on us.

Now is not the time for Australia to play the blame game of countries and who produces green house emissions. Now is the time to take action, be responsible and act as world leaders.

The proposed target of 5-15% is laughable. I guess those that wrote the policy will be the ones that will have to deal with the implication. Unfortunately I will as a gen Y person I will have to deal with it. So as someone that will have to live in a world where Kakadu will most likely not exist, where the great barrier reef is dead, and where water will be scarce I ask you to be serious about climate change. Make that hard decision now for a better life for your children and give us new and exciting opportunities for employment.

Yours with concern,
Prue

Urgent action is needed now on greenhouse gas levels.
Or we will not have a planet to inhabit,
and our children will reap the whirlwind of our foolishness.
Heather vander Reest (Victoria)

I would like to add my voice to those who think that the Governments emission reduction target of 5-15% is inadequate. I believe that we ALL can and want to make a larger effort to slow the effects of climate change by being more ecologically responsible.

We live here in Australia and it is up to us to make a difference and show the rest of the world, by example, that change can happen with forward thinking government.

Yours faithfully,

Lesley Thomson,

Climate change is real and requires a real response from all levels of government and from the public. Federal Government policy on this issue is critical to the success of our response to climate change. Kevin Rudd and his Labour Government need to show the leadership required now to ensure that we make a difference. Today's example of the separation of the Wilkes Ice Shelf is a timely reminder of the perils that lie ahead.

The Government's 15% target for greenhouse pollution by 2020 is inadequate - we need to reduce this to at least 40% by 2020 and the Government leads through the Prime Minister, his Environment and Climate Change ministers in revising their target down to draw it more in line with a realistic figure that will assist in really reducing greenhouse gases. It also needs to link this with strong international diplomacy to ensure that other recalcitrant countries join the committed to develop international agreements that provide targets that show a true commitment to effective targets. This includes a revamping of the CPRS to provide a beneficial plan that will more effectively cap emissions and compensate those companies that reduce carbon pollution, and stimulate the growth and development of industries that produce and use sources of renewable energy.

Peter Temple-Smith

To Whom it may concern,

The Rudd Government I voted for back in 2007 promised hard action on climate change. They promoted themselves as being environmentally conscious and distanced themselves from the Howard Government's out-dated "we don't care unless it makes a profit" flat-out denial of climate change. Rudd ratified the Kyoto Protocol as soon as he was elected, and everybody applauded. Yet 18 months on and he is proposing a policy just as weak and useless as Howard's "let's pretend it doesn't exist and hope they'll leave us alone" plan.

Five to fifteen percent reduction on greenhouse pollution by 2020? We might as well not bother! If your doctor told you that you were obese and if you didn't lose weight soon you would have type 2 diabetes within 5 years, how much weight would you need to lose? A 5% reduction would hardly be enough. You might as well not bother for all the difference that would make.

The science is in: Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years! Think that's not relevant because that's on the other side of the world from us? Closer to home the Great Barrier Reef will be dangerously affected and then where will we be? Our tourism industry, not to mention one of the Natural Wonders of the world, will be in big trouble and thousands of people's quality of life will be endangered.

The currently proposed CPRS is badly designed and favours industry and the big polluters over the environment and the community. 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 weak target of 5-15% and will in fact only make room for industry to pollute more. It's illogical and clearly discourages anyone from really trying to make a personal difference. What kind of government proposes policy that negates any positive change individuals try to make in the community?

Right now there's been a lot of talk about the economic crisis, and rightly so, as millions of people world wide are affected. But in the end it's only money. If we do nothing to stop climate change, and a steady stream of new scientific findings show that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought, then every person on the planet will be affected and there will be no recovery.

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 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.

I have faith in the Rudd Government. Please step up.

Ellen Ronalds

I think it is time for Australia to lead the way in declaring a global climate emergency. 'Global' because no nation, by itself, can tackle the issues. Australians respond well to an emergency, quickly, effectively, and without panic. Nations need desperately to act together to reduce g/h gas pollution by at least 50% by 2020.

Paul Denny

The currently proposed scheme is simply not good enough and, in addition, is badly designed.

What is needed is a simple carbon tax.

As a concrete technologist I know this will hurt, but it is what is needed.

K. Day FIE(AUST),FICE,Hon CIA,FACI

Dear Sir/Madam

I trust that the Rudd govt.,after taking on board outcomes from the recent G20 Summit,will work in collaboration with major World leaders and Environmentalists and Economists to incorporate the latest in scientific technology to assist in making a significant improvement in air quality,soil enhancement and upgrading access to water supply.

Yours sincerely

Maureen,Sydney.

Without going into technical details I want to urge the Government of Australia to take global warming seriously.

In other words to set realistic targets in carbon pollution reduction despite the cries from industry that it will cost them and us dearly. No action will eventually cost us all a lot more. I would also like more action on the individual side. As people we can do a lot more to minimise energy (and water) use but we need strong directions and less pandering (again) to the companies who will have reduced incomes. We must learn to understand that ECONOMIC GROWTH means THE END OF OUR EARTH. Our living standards must be lowered despite cries from our spoilt younger generations. Riet Olifiers
!

The weak policies proposed by the government in addressing the worsening climate change situation are not going to help the economy or the health of the country in the future.

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.

Please review and take into account the longer term costs (20-30 years) of not taking action now.

Thanks,

Emma Shelley

I support a Climate Change Policy that encourages all of us to make a difference to the way we use non-renewable resources.

While a target is important and a higher target say of 15% minimum by 2012 seems reasonable to me as a lay man, the more important aspect is encouraging and forcing us to change.

Only one State has a deposit on bottles (so more get recycled) and that same State is the only one to ban plastic shopping bags. The government must now force the whole of Australia to do likewise and do many other things to reduce waste and limit resource usage.

Cheers

Bill Adams

To the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I wish to express my extreme disappointment at the inadequate targets set out in the proposed emissions trading scheme. Like many Australians, I felt an enormous sense of pride and relief upon the signing of Kyoto. I believed that we had a government who were committed to combating climate change and that I was the citizen of a nation about to lead the globe in environmental policy. That sense of pride is no longer with me.

I'm not going to rehash the arguments I'm sure that have been outlined in thousands of other letters and by organisations such as the ACF and Get Up Australia. But I will implore you to listen to them. We must not ignore the science in an economic trade off. We instead must work harder to reach real, sustainable targets and employ policy to minimize economic loss, with retraining and investment in renewable energy options.

Please review the targets. Please invest in renewable energy. Please don't exclude big polluters from the scheme. Please listen to the science. Please give the people of this country something to be proud of.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Sinclair

Dear Sir / Madam

The Garnaut report made clear the reduction targets to mitigate climate change. The governments target clearly falls short of this report.

On face value most informed Australians and many international countries see the Australian governments committment as weak. This undermines the governments credibility as a nation committed to reducing the imacts of climate change and certainly disenfranchised a sector of Australians who will no doubt speak at the next election.

The targets set in the Garnaut report are based on strong scientific foundation and compelling evidence show climatic change will cause great environmental, social and economic issues for our future sons and daughters.

As a professional in the field, committed to developing low carbon technology and environmental sustainablility, I ask the government to reconsider its 5 - 15% target and take a stronger stance on reducing greenhouse pollution.

Dr Warren Davies
Research Fellow
School of Engineering
Deakin University

To all the decision makers!

Australia's target of 5-15% of cutting emissions is a real disgrace. Knowing what we know and being aware of all the latest scientific findings, Australia should really commit to reducing its greenhouse pollution to over 50% by 2020. This ridiculous target is undermining all efforts to find common ground on an international scale.

Shame on you to mess around with our childrens future like this.

Australia being the driest continent on this planet, should be a leader in takling dangerous climate change with real measures and with the future for our children in view and not just for the next election.

Australia needs to set better/higher targets with a well designed scheme ensuring that we are doing our fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. This will also refocus our economic approach, aiming at new growth industries in renewable energy, rather than keeping 'the old' afloat, just because we've gotten so 'used to it all!!!'

The people seem to be ready for real changes - why are our politicians so numbed when it comes to real action. DO IT FOR OUR CHILDREN - or don't you have any????

Kind regards,

the Kons family (3 children)

Dear Government,

The economic debate on climate change troubles me. There are two key issues that do not seem to be debated fully:

1. The total economic costs of addressing climate change in context is not debated fully.
2. The cost of measures to combat climate change are compared with current costs. They are not compared with the potential costs of doing nothing - some of which are potentially very significant

I am told that the expected cost of significant climate change measures (eg 50% reduction targets) are relatively modest - and to be measured in terms of a few percent of the GDP.

I am also told that the potential costs of not combatting climate change are potentially very significant. There are scenarios with a more than 10% probability (over the next 30 years) where the cost on the economy are very significant (ie >20%).

If these two facts are right then the right "investment" is to spend the few percent of GDP on climate change measures and decrease the risks associated with the significant downside position.

However, if these facts are not right - then we should have a clear fact based debate that is swayed as little as possible by special interest groups.

I am not a "greenie" - but the more I speak to people that I believe are knowledgeable in this area, the more it feels like a no-brainer to drive for significant cuts in emissions (in a unilateral way) sooner rather than later.

Nat

Why have not the Governments, State/Federal not made it possible/probable/easier for home owners/residents to effectively use Solar (wind and other) Power to reduce and reverse the way we have been going. Statistics show Power, Home and Transport contribute more than a third of the bad effects on this Earth. Start to live "IN" the environment don't change it with excessive use Aircon/heaters/appliances/excessive electricity/fuel usage. Disposal of Mobile phones/batteries/printer cartridges/glass/cans/paper are becoming a worry and very unhealthy to the water and soil of the Earth. Much of this can be recycled, local Councils need to get their act together and control this better. Many things we throw out can be fixed, renewed, and used in other ways. Just think about it and stop replacing everything too soon. Just because the TV "flickered" you don't need a new one. Use the millions of old cars, they are better than lots of the new ones anyway, transformed to use cleaner fuel. We need Solarization, now. Govts should send out true knowledgeable people and give some "stimulous" in these areas not just spend/spend/spend for sake of financial sector, Money cannot save the OUR Earth once it has gone thru it's "death".

Susan LV Way

5-15% is not good enough! We need a stronger commitment right now...we have nothing to lose but an industry to gain. Our greatest loss is our global home and if not 'loss' then radical change to the planets weather patterns, oceans and resources.

shaynee tranter

Dear Policy makers, I cant believe the current Australian government is considering only 5-15% reduction targets. I am also amazed at the recent attention that biased industry groups have been getting by suggesting that we "back off" from these reductions until the economy is sound again. Short term thinking all around. If you cant face up to these groups, what are you going to say to your children's children when they ask "if you knew about this- what did you do?" Policy makers, if you go ahead with these shallow targets, then I will be thinking long and hard who I will support in future elections. Kind Regards, Ian Heath heath_ian@hotmail.com

Australia is in a unique position to lead the World and set a realistic target not this wishy washy percentage proposed. We can all pull together and do this. In exactly the same way we rallied around the people of Victoria after the bushfires, the peoples of Thailand, Indonesia and Sri Lank after the tsunamis, we CAN do this. Surely, it is better to take action NOW and not only when these disasters occur, as they will do more often if we don't ACT NOW.

Lilian Andrew

Dear Senator,

There has been almost no mention of encouraging the growth of a commercial scale solar energy industry in this sun-baked country. The first place to start would be in large mining operations in the red centre, which use large amounts of electrical power, currently mostly supplied by trucks that drive in diesel. So if solar (or other low-carbon) sources of power generation capacity could be built, as, for example, Worley Parsons has recently proposed, a very large savings in carbon burned would be guaranteed, and in the long run, money could potentially be saved. If conventional fossil fuels rise again in price as the economy recovers, that economy advantage increases dramatically, saving both the cost of transporting (the majority of currently required) diesel, along with the savings in diesel itself. The government has instead fully backed the coal industry of all things. They probably recognise that this is done for political advantage, mainly in Queensland. But I suspect they could be persuaded, since they claim to have carbon reduction policy (however weak). Thanks for hearing me out.

Sincerely,
Rick McGarvey

What are we waiting for Mr Rudd? There's no choice but to act quickly and positively on climate change. Of all peoples, Australians should recognise this.

Act sir, and we will follow ... Forget the mining lobbyists.

June Saville

Hi,

I believe the the 5-15% target of reducing greenhouse pollution is not high enough. The figure should be higher. For example a reduction of Australias greenhouse pollution of 50% by 2020 (on1990 levels) is far more beneficial goal to aim for. The renewable energy industry is not being utilised enough, large industries are large polluters and should therefore be the main target of reducing greenhouse emmissions. Individuals should be helped by providing services such as individual household waste management systems, and new developments should be forced to create energy efficient dwellings and provide waste systems as mentioned before. I love and respect the environment we live in and Australia has to act on climate change for itself and importantly for the global environment. Therefore Australia needs to increase its target so it does not undermine efforts to form a crucial international agreement on climate change at the UN conference in Copenhagen, December.

I hope my thoughts are acted on.

Alan Wright

To the Prime Minister and his cohorts,

I do not understand the Government's weak greenhouse-gas targets!

Do politicians care more about NOT offending vested interests and in being re-elected than leaving their children and grandchildren a sustainable, still in-balance, planet?

Surely no more proof is needed that we MUST seriously reduce greenhouse gasses in every way we can, and to move away from coal-burning and defoliating policies.

Enjoy the next couple of years in Government, I won't be voting for you the way you are pussyfooting on this issue (and there are a lot of folk with the same sentiments as me).

It won't be the Liberals who get in either; it will be the Greens and any independent who promises to act responsibly on this issue.

Good-bye,

Bill Westerbeek

Please Mr Rudd,

We need to take much stronger action on climate change NOW. It's one of my greatest disappointments since you were elected that this government has chosen such a timid and inadequate stance on this most critical emergency. Please! Do your part to help save this beautiful planet, so precariously teetering on the edge at present.

Best regards,

Rob Fakes

As a father of two young children, I am deeply concerned about the lack of urgency and seriousness on the part of the Federal Government that is reflected in the 5% target for cuts in greenhouse emissions by 2020. This is compounded by a CPRS that provides far too many incentives for polluting industries and lobbies at the expense of responsible businesses and ordinary Australians, the vast majority of whom share my concern about this issue.

Nearly every week brings new confirmation - both scientific and experiential - that the negative impacts of climate change are occurring much more rapidly than had previously been thought possible or likely. We have an extremely narrow window of opportunity to undertake the historic task of transforming our economy and culture to a post-carbon, lower energy form.

The Climate Change imperative to de-carbonise our economy and lifestyles is given added urgency by the imminent energy crisis now unfolding around the world, in the form of the peak of oil extraction and production. Many expert commentators consider that this peak took place last year; others say it will happen at the latest in 2010. What this means is that the current low prices are a temporary respite, and once economic growth resumes prices will shoot to new highs as the reality of oil decline at a rate between 3 - 6% per annum is fully digested by the markets. This is truly a national emergency that demands the urgent attention of the Senate and the Federal Government. So far it has only been tackled at the level of states (eg the recent South Australian inquiry on Peak Oil -

<http://www.parliament.sa.gov.au/Committees/Select/LC/51/PeakOil/ImpactofPeakOilonSouthAustralia.htm>) and by forward-thinking local councils and communities that have begun re-localisation initiatives

in the form of local food networks and Transition Initiatives. I would urge the Senate to commence an inquiry in the shortest possible time frame on the implications of Peak Oil for Australia as a whole.

Sincerely

Nick Rose

I'm really disappointed with the Government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. It seems to me to do nothing effective to reduce the total amount of emissions nor to really compel the polluters to mend their ways nor to encourage growth in renewables, which is absolutely essential if we are even to reach the proposed target, which is way too weak anyway. It's URGENT to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 -I am not alone to see the beneficial effects of doing so--but I want them for my children and grandchildren,
Jennifer Strauss AM

My wife and I consider the Government's 5 to 15% reduction in green house gases to be totally inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Australia, under the Rudd Government, initially lead the charge for meaningful climate change figures and received the support of voters at the election poll booths. However following the Garnout report which was a milder version of what was required, we have since fallen well behind, and selected a very weak target. The Australian people will support a sensible approach to climate change and will support a reduction in Australian greenhouse gas pollution by 50% by 2020. We and other Australians are looking for leadership on this very important matter and will be disappointed if we do not get that for which we voted.

Yours sincerely,

Florence and Lionel Hanney.

The Govt should be starting up our own solar panel manufacturing plants to create jobs, and promoting the use of these panels on every available flat surface, then pay for the clean power produced by them. At the moment they are just tinkering around the edge of renewable energy.

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.

Denis Hanrahan

I am devastated by the government's 5-15% target on climate change. This is not achieving anywhere near enough and how can we possibly influence other countries at the UN Conference on Climate Change in December when our government's position is so weak. One of the deciding factors of voting to office Kevin Rudd's government was his seemingly strong position on climate change as opposed to the stagnant policy of John Howard. A large sheet of Antarctic ice is breaking away. We MUST have a stronger target. The USA now has a leader who seems to be prepared to confront pollution. I hoped Kevin Rudd would also- rather than simply sounding supportive as he stands on the world stage. sincerely Jill Eden

To the Australian Government,

I feel you have let me down. I voted for Labor in the last election because I thought your environmental policies would do some good. Now I am sadly disappointed. The proposed scheme is weak and supports the continuation of pollution. Just because we are in, or close to, a recession doesn't mean we can take a short sighted approach.

Please make the CPRS strong enough to do some good. Look at what has just happened to the ice shelf in Antarctica this week if you need any more convincing. Judith Paxton

Why can't we have regular blackout nights in the C.B.D
and educate the big industries. Have more young people
promoting, conserving energy, especially among the ethnic
groups. My ethnic friends are hard to convince.

Wilga Leone

To the select inquiry of climate change. Please take note of the collapse of a great ice bridge yesterday in Antarctica! This shows that the ice cap is melting faster than predicted. I beg you to take urgent action in relation to the target for carbon reduction. It needs to be much higher eg 15-20%. We cannot mess around on this issue and need to ignore the pressure groups wanting less action. The GFC should not stop urgent action. More support for green energy options to be developed such as "hot rocks" in SA should be funded instead of paying the coal industry to try to sequester carbone dioxide - will take much too long and the "hot rocks" have been proved to be able to supply base power 24 hours a day for the grid, at no cost to the environment. Would also make more infrastructure work and employ more people. Please take action to change the government proposals.

Marelle Harisun

Dear Government Employee:

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

Sincerely,
Holly

The scientific evidence is there, my fear and that of countless others is that we will act too little too late. As it is, serious consequences will change the face of our planet and its capacity to sustain us. What we do now is crucially important.

Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% at least by 2020, and show the way for strong international and co-operative agreements.

Please refocus our economy to the obvious growth industries in renewable energy and set an uncompromising scheme of standards to ensure industry is forced to REDUCE their greenhouse emissions-not trade them off against the action individuals and small businesses take.

The time for talk and compromise for profit is well and truly over- my grandchildren's future is being completely eroded, endangered and impoverished by our inability to act in a concerted and united way. My retirement looks frightening and sad- I am so sad for the earth and all that live upon it.

I've planted trees, vegetables, changed lightbulbs, sold one of our cars, am going solar- anything that I can- its YOUR job as politicians to approach this unprecedented problem with the same verve, intelligence, vigour and energy as you would a war, an invasion or a major disease. Lead us, not with half hearted and compromised, inadequate targets, but with vision and hard, decisive action!!!!

Yours sincerely

Eva de Heer

I am a senior scientist with over 30 years experience in industry and in research. I am very concerned that the flood of scientific evidence pointing to acceleration in climate change is being ignored by the media and by our leaders. The economy is of transitory concern compared to the real and growing threat of global warming. The survival of humanity is at stake, not only from rising temperatures and sea levels, but also from the increasing acidification of the oceans, as highlighted by the IPCC in their most recent report. This phenomenon has the potential to disrupt the food chain upon which all life on earth depends, including mankind.

Unfortunately, the Australian Government's response to this crisis has been totally inadequate. The CO2 emissions reduction target is manifestly inadequate and the mechanism they have chosen poorly designed, in that any reductions in emissions can be sold off to other emitters, with the result being no net gain. We need to think again but we need to act within the next 2 years, otherwise it may be too late, if it is not already. Personally, I do not relish another summer with water restrictions, temperatures over 45°C for a week and hundreds killed in bushfires; but it is the fate of future generations that should be of concern to all of us with access to the levers of power.

Australia has a vast area of land with high light fluxes that could potentially meet all our energy needs. But instead of supporting the research required to tap this inexhaustible and sustainable resource, the policy of governments of both political parties has been to support the discredited notion of 'clean coal', propping up the very industries we desperately need to replace. I urge the Senate to take a more aggressive stance on emissions abatement. Let's have a massive injection of funding into the universities and CSIRO for photovoltaics. Let's support Australian car manufacturers in producing electric cars with acceptable performance and economy; not in 5 years, not in 10, but by 2010. The technology exists, it is only the money that is lacking from a finance industry that does not have the foresight to realise that their profits will dry up along with rainfall in southern Australia. Finally, let's have support for a distributed electrical power system; phot

ovoltaics on every roof.

Sincerely, Dr Noel Clark

As a nation Australia must do more to tackle climate change. The public has taken on this challenge and many people are working to reduce their share of greenhouse emissions, but we need industry and business need to do much more if any progress is to be made. The Government need to act to ensure that big polluters do more, this is what most Australians want.

Adrienne Doig

We have to do better.

The science is quite simple, even I can understand it (refer Al Gore's film). Since that was made the best evidence we have points to the 2007 IPCC report being wildly conservative!! The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

We shouldn't compensate polluters at the expense of the community and environment. This is not about jobs or money.

When the effects of global warming take effect over the next 40 years, I won't be here to see it, but my children and grand-children will.

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

Cheers

Peter

To whome it may concern,

I am a concerned citizen and I vote.

I am writing because I am discusted by the governments current stance on climate change. A reduction of 5-15% of carbon emissions is not at all close to where we need to be.

we cannot expect the rest of the world to take climate change seriously if all we offer is this petty amount of carbon reductions. i am aware that the state of the economy is of the utmost concern to the government but i think it should be quite obviouse that climate change has much larger consequences than a slow in the economy.

reducing our carbon emmisions can have a positive affect on the economy. it promotes jobs in other areas.

The time to stand up strongly on climate change policy has come.

regards

Anne Pentony

Dear Senators,

I note with alarm the latest evidence of climate change with the Age reporting the melting down of the Wilkins Ice Shelf. It is clear that climate change is happening much more rapidly than we thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

We must urgently reduce our carbon emissions. The Government's 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. This is a weak target which will undermine efforts to form crucial international agreement. This must be improved before the important UN Conference on climate change in Copenhagen in December.

Australia must do its fair share! We need to 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.

Instead of the weak target proposed Australia should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Yours truly,

Colleen Hackett

The CPRS is flawed.

A 5% target is not enough. Australia's per capita emissions are far too high for this to set an adequate international example. Australia's unilateral 2020 target should be at least 30% on 1990 levels.

The use of Gateway targets, which lock in future emission levels is a stupid idea. Although certainty does need to be given to the business community to encourage investment, this could also be done with a price floor. The use of gateways significantly restricts Australia's ability to respond to new scientific information

The price ceiling is too low, and when combined with the banking of permits introduces uncertainty not only over the emissions in any given year, but also over future years. A traditional strength of emission trading schemes is the certainty it places over future emissions - the ceiling price undermines this, without providing any of the benefits that a carbon tax would have introduced.

The EITE assistance is excessive and does not adhere to the polluter pays principle. The most polluting industries are compensated at the expense of the rest of society. This is not fair. There is no justification for such a large amount of assistance. Arguments based on carbon leakage are false. The physical relocation of Australia's polluting industries is unlikely - this has been shown not to occur. Investment decisions are based on a number of factors - one of which is cost, but others include political risk in a country, infrastructure, the comparative regulatory burden, the availability of skilled labour in each country to name a few. Leakage which is supposed to occur through changes in demand is also unlikely to occur. These export industries are also exposed to exchange rate risks, which presents far larger fluctuations in their comparative costs than the addition of a price on carbon. The only thing that will change is their profitability. Which should

change. It is time that these industries pay for a portion of the damages they impose on the rest of society. The EITE assistance should be abolished and replaced with more comprehensive assistance to low income households, especially the unemployed, and also invested into research and development for new, cleaner technologies.

The exclusion of emissions from native forests creates a perverse incentive where plantation forests can earn credits, while no emissions from the destruction of native forests require permits. This could well result in the further destruction of our native forests.

Abolish the CPRS. Introduce a carbon tax, which is far less open to political manipulation. Make everyone pay the carbon tax, and extend assistance to low income households.

Regards,

Alex Lloyd

1. I thought Saint Kevin was giving us new hope to save us and the world but with the pathetic commitment to climate change all I can say is good luck to those in US of A and the rest of the world who think Barack Obama will commit: You say he "has given new hope, not only to Americans but to many Australians as well, people are now excited about the possibility of changing our society for the better."

I was excited about his election as I was with Rudd's but am now totally disillusioned even though I should know better being old and cynical. Our Government's weak target of 5-15% reduction in green house gases sends the wrong message to the rest of the world.

2. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is just giving polluting industries to right to pollute more - it is similar to the EPA scheme that simply charged polluters for the amount that they polluted - not an incentive to reduce pollution which in most cases is more expensive but in the long term absolutely necessary if we have a future.

June Lunsmann

As a member of the Australian Photovoltaic community I urge you to aim for stronger emission reduction targets. Strong targets and feed-in-tariffs for renewable energy sources will lead to innovation and job creation and will enable our country to deal with the immense challenges that face us.

Nicole Kuepper

The government's proposed 5-15% target for emissions reductions is both embarrassing and irresponsible. Given the information which is coming in everyday on the unexpected acceleration in global warming, it is absolutely essential that we set a target which will make a difference.

Our economy and our situation allows us to take much more dramatic action than many other less well off countries and we must set an example which gives confidence to others to make hard decisions. I support a target of at least 50% by 2020, based on 1990 levels.

Our highly polluting coal fired power stations and power generating industry, must be forced to invest NOW in renewable energies such as solar and wind, as well as tidal. I do not support nuclear power - it may save on CO2 now but the generations which follow will have to deal with the toxic waste from mining and processing, as well as from the power production itself.

With advances so far in photo voltaics (mainly by Australian researchers!!) it is possible for many larger buildings to become net power generators, and more research as well as tax incentives should be directed towards achieving as much of this form of power generation as possible. Both domestically and commercially.

Another major source of CO2 is the production of cement. Research on the reduction in concrete use is well overdue. A major factor in this is the accepted standard to demolish existing buildings and replace with new, usually concrete and steel. There should be more incentives to retain and adapt existing structures and codes and compliance conditions should be reviewed to make this easier. Retention and re-use is an accepted practice in other countries where they have a large stock of older buildings and this must become the norm here as well.

The government should be brave and creative. If they are not, there will be no world for our children to live in.

Alan Croker

Nothing but a strong international effort is likely to arrest the build up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere leading to global warming and ocean acidification.

Australia should be leading the world in its efforts toward sustainability and arresting what could well be a runaway damaging process. Global population projections make the matter even more urgent. We are in dire need of a population policy that should aim at stabilising our existing population and perhaps even reducing it. Fecundity should be discouraged instead of encouraged. Out with the baby bonus and any other similarly perverse policies! If we need to keep our population suitably mixed then we can use immigration to achieve this.

Tight enforceable targets towards CO2 reduction are a must and much more encouragement needs to be given for individual efforts such as PV panel installation and anything else that makes a positive contribution.

Australia is in a unique position to be an exemplar in this and with suitable government incentives we can develop a range of technologies that could be exported.

John Ellson

I have been very disappointed with the government's environmental "initiatives". Many Australians thought that the change of government would really change the dynamics on climate change, carbon reduction and energy production. However, the change has been small.

I have been disgusted at the way that much of industry is being allowed to duck their share of responsibility. Many of us are spending appreciable amounts of our own money to help improve our surroundings. We feel let down by special pleas by some industries being granted. We can understand the pleas of trade exposed industries and the fine line between protectionism and competition. But groups like the coal fired power stations are not subject to overseas competition and are getting a free run compared to solar and wind energy.

The present CPRS is poorly designed - you have access to plenty of reports on this.

The GFS is causing the government to adopt the Howard mantra that carbon reduction costs jobs. How is it that "sunny" Germany has such a high proportion of solar manufacturers and users? Ditto Denmark and wind farms? It just takes a bit of leadership.

Distributed energy production reduces costs of reticulation and losses in power lines. Encourage more people to INVEST in home energy production. Beach houses are a prime example - they could be producing most of the time but not under a stupid scheme that you can't run a negative electricity account. (I know this is a state matter, but it would be nice if the federal government showed some leadership.)

John Cashion

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,
Jessica Edquist.

Dear Senators

Thank you for holding an inquiry into the government policy for climate change.

The Rudd government was strongly voted into position on the basis of climate change policy promises, which it is currently failing to fulfill.

If we are to be considered leaders in the political sphere rather than the country that drags at the heels and imposes restrictions, current targets are not at all adequate. Our government is not being honest in saying that this is the position of leaders. I agree with the GetUp group when they recommend that 50% emission reductions are needed by 2020. This situation goes beyond politics. The future of our planet is what is at stake here and this needs to be taken seriously, if the government is truly to represent the people of this country whose desires are clear.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme does not favour positive reduction. It is more of an encouragement to industry to continue unchecked, and a discouragement to individuals to act. This needs to be scrapped, and a scheme that is truly representative to be enforced.

If the Rudd government has any hope of being re-elected, if Kevin Rudd really stands behind his grand talk, we will see these steps taken.

Yours sincerely

Helen Cameron

The scientific evidence is overwhelming, and the science community is in despair at governmental inaction. I share their deep concern. Climate change is killing Australians now - the bushfire victims plus heatwave victims numbered around 500 in just a few days. Worldwide tens of thousands are harmed by heat, drought, floods, sealevel rise every day. And it has barely begun.

This is more important than the economy. We are disappointed that our hopes in the Rudd government have not been fulfilled, and deeply cynical about Penny Wong and Peter Garrett's pathetic response. We need vision and leadership. This is the earth's greatest threat.

Please show some courage and leadership on climate.

Steve Biddulph

Without our planet all the headline news about the economic crisis will pale into insignificance. We cannot ignore these changes that are affecting us all. We need to step out of our comfort zones and take action - mother nature has been patient. When will we listen?

Please listen to what people want. Please be more real, less political and responsive to what we the people want.

Ellen

Please show leadership to the world by taking action to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% on 1990 levels by the year 2020.

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.

Leadership on this issue will take courage. All people of good will and good sense will back the government on this.

Sincerely

Elaine Godden

Last night on the news I saw a report on an Antarctic ice-bridge that had broken away leaving the entire ice-shelf in jeopardy and revealing solid evidence that climate change is happening now and a lot faster than scientists had predicted.

Therefore I believe Australia's weak 5-15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels).

We also require a better Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) that encourages individuals like me, community groups, and small business for reducing consumption and working toward a greater target of cutting emissions and ensures that large companies are also doing their bit to cut emissions rather than taking advantage of credits created by us.

Together we can do it.

Yours sincerely,

Neika Huss

the government's climate change policy is insufficient to tackle global warming. An inquiry should investigate recent evidence and urge for greater cuts to gas emissions. Further, permits should not be handed out to polluters. I understand in the end its the consumer who must pay because it is the consumer who must lower their consumption. Cheap energy only encourages waste so polluters should be penalised in order to reduce production by increasing cost of their products.

Regards,
Robert Shield

I think the current Governments stand on climate change lacks courage, insight, foresight and leadership. Australia is in a perfect position to take a strong and early lead internationally to gain and sustain the moral high ground and create a new trading block of clean green committed countries. Imagine free trade agreements based on like environmental and cultural objectives.

Emotive - yes, risky - perhaps if it is not well thought through. Do the analysis, sieze the initiative, be leaders not followers, lead the world away from whatever disasters are around the cornere. David Harris MD RaptorSSC

I am writing to suggest in the strongest possible way that you take seriously the issue of climate change and respond to this threat in a much stronger way. We should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Jobs, the economy and our future survival are linked in with the issue of climate change and cannot be treated as separate issues.

It is time to act with a much better designed carbon pollution reduction scheme not one which rewards heavy polluters.

As the government of the day future generations are depending on you to act with courage and foresight.

Sincerely

Persia Wildwood

The evidence is coming in now that the IPCC forecasts for our weather which were made in 1991 , 1995 and 2001 have failed to predict the weather in 2009. The changes are much worse with climate change occurring much faster than they had predicted by their models. These are facts not speculations. Any policy which fails to accept this and fails to set appropriate targets is doomed to failure and will deny our children the use of a healthy planet which we so richly enjoy.

I appeal to all parliamentarians to stop bickering and make plans which will lower our greenhouse pollution by an absolute minimum of 50% by 2020 from 1990 levels. Individuals are ready to assist but the perverse effect of the CPRS means that the only way we can cause the big polluters to reduce their emissions is by individuals polluting as much as they can. This of course is rubbish but even though the community is ready to help reduce pollution, polluters have convinced Government that so many jobs will be lost that these targets cannot be entertained.

It is shameful that so many of our enterprising ideas and citizens have gone overseas to develop new energy efficient processes because of the poor current and past policies. There could be now in Australia industries with thousands of jobs working towards assisting with climate change mitigation. It is very distressing for me to see how hoodwinked the Government has become.

The opposition has performed very badly in my view and the current government was voted in to govern , not just try to see the survival of the planet through an economic prism.

Warren Johnson AM

My submission is that Australia is capable of making the very substantial cuts in greenhouse gas emissions that are shown to be necessary by extensive and increasingly demanding evidence of human induced climate change.

Not only has it been shown that Australia is capable of making much more significant cuts than the current government proposes, but there was, at the time this government came to power, very strong public support and willingness to participate in achieving the necessary cuts. This government has squandered that public support for comprehensive action through a range of actions, most recent of which is its cynical emissions trading scheme that not only dilutes or removes incentives for industry to make meaningful cuts, but also renders meaningless any reductions achieved by community action outside of the ETS.

Your inquiry should recommend scrapping the ETS in its current form, and preferably should not recommend any form of ETS at all. Instead it should propose a range of measures that allow for extensive contributions by all segments of Australian society, and includes a carbon tax that takes into account the emissions generated in the production and marketing of particular products or categories of products.

A carbon tax should apply to exports as well as imports and domestically produced goods.

A major part of the greenhouse gas reduction strategy should be a phasing out of the coal industry, including exports, within fifteen years. This should be accompanied by a recognition of the minimal employment generated by the coal industry, the magnitude of the wide variety of subsidies provided to the coal industry, and the unrealistic nature of claims that effective and adequate carbon sequestration can be achieved in the necessary time.

This should be paralleled by support for expansion of renewable energy generation (not including nuclear power) to replace coal generated power. In the meantime no new coal fired power stations should be built.

Gordon Claridge

dear senators, i wish to state that i think the governments greenhouse gas targets are seriously deficient. rather than a miniscule target of 5-15%, (which is laughable, considering that scientists around the world are sounding very alarmed), we should be aiming for a target of 50% by 2020.

given that scientists are saying that the arctic summer sea ice may now completely melt within 5 years, it's time the government started leading for the people and the planet, rather than big business.

the carbon pollution reduction scheme needs re-designing, big polluters must pay, and the government must get serious about designing a strong scheme. we need to lead the world if necessary. we need to refocus economically and start investing in alternative energy sources. wasting time and money on carbon sequestration and the like is playing a fools game. stop fiddling while rome burns, please.

thankyou deni sevenoaks

Due to the urgency of the need to respond adequately, I ask that the reduction target for greenhouse emission be increased to 50% by 2020. The earth is our future, and our children's future. We want strong action on this issue.

Angela Chambers

I wanted to let the senate know I believe the Rudd government's targets cuts of 5-5% of 1990 levels to be woefully inadequate. It's own Garnaut report suggested much harder cuts and the Australian people voted at the last election on the assumption that the government would be acting according to that report to avert serious climate change.

Recent scientific evidence suggests that the effects of climate change are being seen far earlier than previous models of worse case scenarios predicted. Why, when Australia is so much at risk of serious economic, social and environmental danger, are we placing such an insignificant target. This weak target is undermining international efforts to form a crucial world-wide agreement and needs to be seriously revised before December's UN Conference on Climate Change.

One of the worst things about the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) proposed by the Government is that it is poorly designed. Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the actions that I and others take to reduce energy usage will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target. Their action will only make more room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap. For someone like me who has paid to insulate my house, pays for 100% green energy, catches public transport and uses little heating and no cooling systems through the year, this is very, very maddening. All of my efforts are for naught, as are the efforts of so many Australians.

Now is the time for Australia to take responsibility for the dirty coal that it has sold for so many years and will continue to do so. Now is the time for us to show the world that we are sorry for our enormous, per-capita carbon footprint and we are prepared to show the world how to make amends. Not only will this be a clear signal to other countries that this needs to be taken seriously, it will also take advantage of the relatively infant renewable energy market. We could be world leaders in many of these areas and export our expertise around the world.

As a new father, I implore you to not allow this weak policy to pass without serious amendments. We DO need an emissions trading scheme as the policy states. However, as someone who has been studying this topic for over ten years, I am worried that my daughter will not know the Australian habitats I know. She won't see the Great Barrier Reef in all its splendour. She won't know the seasons as we currently experience them. She won't have the food security we currently have when the Murray-Darling is dead.

Thankyou,
Tristan StClare

Hello

Australia needs to be a LEADER in emissions reduction, not just wait to see what other developed countries are doing and saying we MIGHT set a target of 15%. Why not 25% like Garnaut suggested?

We have to act NOW!

Stephanie Edwards

Get real!!! We need a much better ie larger target for reducing our emissions. Evidence shows that time is running out. No Antarctic sea ice within 5 years! Who would have ever believed that? We need to be leading the way, not waiting for other countries to play 'catch up'. And why are we paying the large polluters who foul our world? Let's set a strong target which ensures that we do our fair share of reducing the risk.

Rita Richards

Perhaps the upside of the financial crisis is that the necessary slowing of consumption may help us rethink our habits. Trust us on this: I do think Australians can meet a crisis head on and are ready for action. We met our water targets this summer and last, we came out to fight the fires. Let us do something. Every morning the reports are worse, every day the prognosis is more depressing. Legislate against some things that pollute. Heavily support our alternative energy research and back those who have found solutions. Make them our new heroes. I know it's a balancing act economically but if you need any reassurance that we will support a tough stand to save the planet, you have this citizen's. Good luck. Leslie Spencer

Like the majority of Australians, I believed that when we voted the Rudd Government in, it would take a strong stand on measures to combat Climate Change. I now find we have another government with wishy-washy targets that will do nothing to halt the changes that are already taking place in our own country.

While I know we are a small country and our efforts alone will not have a great effect on Climate Change, if we do nothing, no one else will either. We need to develop environmentally friendly industries instead of allowing them to go to other, more receptive countries, and we need to stop letting the multi-million dollar corporations dictate their own selfish terms to us.

Australia needs to go to the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December with a strong commitment to reduce greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 and a strong well-designed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that will ensure we are doing our fair share to limit the effects of Climate Change on our world.

Catherine Haddow

We all know that the facts are in regarding global warning so I don't intend to quote facts and figures to you - you already have them to hand. I will just mention the very latest finding about the melting of the Antarctic ice shelf - surely 'a bridge too far'? And make the point that we have recovered in the past from financial crises and, I believe, that this government is doing all it can to reduce the harm contained therein, but it will be too late to retain any quality of life on our beautiful planet if we do not act NOW to tackle greenhouse pollution. The government's target is woefully inadequate. We should be endeavouring to reach 50% by 2020. We have a world to save.

Helen Bowers

To whom it may concern,

The Governments current emissions reduction scheme, with a target of only 5-15% is entirely inadequate. Australia should be leading the way in setting an example to lesser developed countries, by putting in place a strong scheme with a target of no less than 40-50% by 2020. The Governments currently proposed "Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme" is poorly designed. It unnecessarily overcompensates polluters at the expense of not just the environment, but the community as well.

I ask that new targets of a much more aggressive nature our committed to by the December UN conference on climate change, so as Australia not once again humiliated with such pitiful targets.

Rowan Harding

We live outside of Myrtleford in North-Eastern Victoria and have fought off 3 major bushfires in the last 8 years. It beggars belief that the leaders that we have put our trust in to guide this failing ship are reluctant to do all that is humanly possible to direct us, with courage and commitment, towards a sustainable future. What's the problem? It all seems so obvious that we MUST do what it takes to halt climate change, and we must act now. We don't have the time to simply pass it all on to another generation. We must set a strong target within a well-designed scheme that will ensure that Australia does its fair share to avoid the worst effects of climate change, and it will have the added benefit of refocussing our economy on the non polluting and productive growth industries in renewable energy. Let's just do it!

Yours sincerely, Trevor Patrick.

Today's news of the breaking away of an ice shelf in Antarctica, again highlights the need for climate action NOW.

The number of Australians who participated in Earth Hour in 2009 shows that people want action. The government must increase its target. I voted for the Rudd government with faith that they would take REAL action on climate change.

All Australian businesses should be required to cut their energy use by 50% by 2020. The big polluters should be heavily taxed, with all funds being invested into energy efficiencies (including development of infrastructure ie public transport, solar panels for apartments, more efficient cars and investing in the environment (eg buying back farm land and regenerating the land or providing farmers with the role of looking after such replanted land for a certain period of time).

On the reverse side, I think every business should have to submit a plan to reduce their carbon footprint and be rewarded if they meet their targets.

The government should invest in technology for houses and businesses to cut their energy.

Please give this issue the attention it needs.

Susan Jones

The Government's 5-15% target they are trying to deliver is not what I voted for. I firmly believe in larger (greater than 50%), mandatory targets. Not only will Australia soon bear a massive burden from climate change rivaling any economic crisis it has faced to date, but fittingly it is amongst the largest per-capita contributors to emissions today. The time has come to lead the world in cutting our emissions, by investing in burgeoning green generation technologies like solar thermal, transport revolutions such as electric bicycles and cars, and not in ridiculously flawed concepts such as "clean" coal and carbon capture. Even the government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme itself is flawed: in trying to maintain some sort of 'fairness' they are intending to subsidise the carbon tax for coal power for a number of years. This completely misses the point! We want less coal fired generators, and more renewables, not subsidised coal. And why do they not support the academia

lly accepted biochar? Many questions such as these need to be asked, and the solutions need to be prompt and far-reaching. A better target for Australia is urgently needed, and our government is not providing it.

Gordon McDonald

I don't imagine anyone will ever read this, but if you do ask yourself what the world's climate will be like in 20 years time. With the combination of cutting down the trees, burning the fossil fuels, warming the ocean (with its effect on plankton). If we don't act strongly we're going to kill the biosphere and ourselves in the process. Let's face it, we're all going to have to make sacrifices and start paying to repair the damage. Please set a strong target in line with the submissions from Getup. I am an independent thinker and I totally agree with the thrust of Getup's campaign. I can speak for my whole family and say that our concerns will show themselves at every election by our support of candidates who are willing to commit to strong action even if it means sacrificing our standard of living as measured by income and consumption of goods and services.

Jack Claff.

It seems clear to me that we are already past the point where we can hope to avoid the harmful consequences of climate change brought about by human actions. I am a forty two year old Australian born white woman and I believe it is essential that we get on with the necessary policy changes and follow through actions NOW - if we want to have a habitable continent to live in in our old age - let alone what kind of a global mess we are leaving to my children's generation. I know its scary, and that some of the necessary measures will not be popular, but I believe that our elected representatives have a moral duty to take on board the steady stream of new scientific findings that show that climate change is happening rapidly and take steps accordingly. At this stage Australia is still relatively privileged in terms of available resources and standards of living - when looked at in global terms - but this will not last if we all keep on going as we currently are - like lemmings

over the cliff.

I want to be able to feel proud to be an Australian, and to feel like the actions that I and my family and friends take will actually help with making the difference, not just give license to Australian industry to continue business as usual.

yours sincerely,

Catherine de Garis

To the Australian Government. The recently announced targets for Australia to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 5-15% before 2020 is appalling.

This is a very serious time for Governing Australia on this issue. We really need to be decisive and committed to turning things around.

I am so sick of narrow minded, weak leaders who can't see the potential in driving and moulding markets in order to make this situation profitable or atleast sustainable for Australia.

Look at china, soon they will have the entire car market at their doorsteps as they are investing money into green automobiles. They are seeing the future and are ready to jump on it and make it work for them.

With the current proposal the government is stubbornly holding onto the past and refusing to accept the reality and the change that must take place.

The only way to come out of this situation on top is to act fast and get a good share of the market for all the products and technology that will be needed to make this change.

Please be forward thinking about this.

Sincerely,
Sarah Thomas

Climate change is the scariest thing I have ever encountered. The Australian Government's commitment to only a 5% cut (maximum 15%) is deeply, woefully inadequate. We have to do much better. We CAN do better - we just need the political will.

I recently heard that there is now good evidence that the conditions that caused the Victorian bushfires were definitely the result of the changing climate, and not a statistical anomaly. The length of the run of hot days that lead up to it was statistically implausible, sure, but the fact that the temperature didn't cool off at night (as it has done in previous heat waves, such as that which preceded the 1939 Black Friday fires) provides evidence of a dangerous qualitative change in our climate.

This has occurred as a result of the 0.6 degree warming that has occurred so far.

CSIRO data predicts (at present) about a 3.4 degree warming by 2070 (2.2-5 degree) - and those figures are already 2 years out of date. I can't even imagine what that would do - and not just to bushfires, either.

If we don't cut our emissions deeply, very soon, climate change is due to become self-sustaining as a result of a range of positive-feedback cycles, including (among other things) loss of albedo from melting ice-caps and carbon release from melting permafrost.

A 5% cut by 2020 is miniscule, verging on irrelevant - we need a 50% cut to have a hope of stalling climate change. Australia is one of the world's two worst per-capita emitters, even if our small population makes our total contribution relatively low. We can't ask other countries to make big sacrifices if we aren't willing to stand up and be counted.

Even worse, the greenhouse-abatement actions that I take at home will now simply free up permits for polluting industries to keep doing exactly what they were doing before!!! (how is this fair?)

The 5% target is inadequate - and falls a LONG way short of the changes I voted for.

Robyn Whipp

A much greater effort to slow climate change is required to preserve the Antarctic sea ice and ice cap and Australia must make a greater contribution so that we do not undermine the resolve of the UN Conference on Climate Change.

A bigger commitment NOW will foster new industries in renewable energy at a time when the creation of new jobs is crucial to our economy.

The current proposed Carbon Trading Scheme allows far too much latitude to large companies, and allows an overall avoidance of any real reduction of carbon pollution.

The government must increase the reduction target to 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Thank you for your attention to this email.

Judith Bossard

My husband and I are very disappointed with the Government's weak policy of setting a 5-15% target to reduce carbon pollution and thus hopefully avoid dangerous climate change. The proposals so far aired appear to be totally inadequate given the steady stream of new and alarming scientific evidence such as the increased speed of the melting of the Arctic summer ice.

The over-compensation to polluters is a particular problem and while understanding the Government's position in not wanting business to be forced to cut jobs in the current recession, we must surely be looking to ways of cutting back polluters and financing new growth industries in renewable energy to assist with the employment problem.

Please increase the target for reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020 so that there may be some chance of leaving a better environment for our children.

Joyce Gardner

Really strong action must be taken to minimise climate warming NOW, i.e. our Govt needs to redesign its CPRS to genuinely reduce our emissions substantially over a much reduced time frame and pull back on it's over-generous compensations for the major polluters, also - and most importantly - it must immediately start phasing out our dependence on and mining (and exporting) of coal and recognise the nonsense of the "clean coal"so-called solution. ALL resources put into this furphy must be redirected into renewable energy production which, if properly managed, would also provide the jobs needed as coal mining is phased out.

Please Mr Rudd, help save our world including the Barrier Reef, Murray-Darling and other threatened environments and species (including our own) if it's not too late; at least do your best by getting onto the right track.

Sincerely, Jenny Coman

Dear Sir/Madam,

I realise that Australia is a small country on the world stage. In the grand scheme of things, our emissions are not really responsible for a large proportion of the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere which are already altering the world's climate.

But it is clear that Australia stands to lose much from global warming, and as a first world economy we should be setting an example, rather than dragging our heels on this issue.

Please choose a strong target which reflects the will of the Australian people to significantly reduce our carbon pollution. We are ready to meet this challenge.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Paul O'Farrell

Dear Labour,

5% simply isn't good enough; you know why so I won't bother pointing it out. I will say however that the systemic attitude of "we're not going to commit to (whatever) unless they (US, UK, China, whoever...) do first" will ultimately lead to disastrous inaction.

Secondly; it doesn't take a genius to work out that "going green" will create more jobs than it loses and be beneficial to the economy (which is false anyway, but that's another story, AND by the way, have you all forgotten that the economy exists to support people and not vice versa?) by creating the necessity for retraining, development and implementation of new infrastructure, etc. The arguments against are simply excuses from industries WHO BENEFIT FROM NOT TAKING ACTION.

This government has the opportunity to do something truly meaningful and of lasting importance in the best interest of its citizens; it's what we voted for. You work for us and we expect you to do our bidding, don't let us down.

Sincerely,
Paul Handel

I believe the current targets do not take into consideration where we need to be to protect our environment. I ask that all politicians irrespective of which party they belong to, work together to ensure we take care of our nation and then we can encourage other nations to do the same.

Neil Biggs

Dear Prime Minister, Minister for Climate Change, and Environment Minister,

For a while it looked as though Australia was going to lead the world in measures to protect it against global warming and the resultant climate change. Now however, it appears that we are going to tag along at the end of the line, leaving it to other countries to make the running. Whatever has happened to our courage?

If the US is now (under new leadership, you'll note!) talking about an 80% reduction by 2050, why can't we be a bit stronger and more principled than a measly 5%?

If the entire Antarctic sea ice cover appears to be breaking up already - as witnessed over the last two days - why can't we take significant action NOW?

Forget about the difficult CPRS. Let's put some real money into developing geothermal power, wind and solar power, and encourage individual citizens to follow their conscience by rewarding individual spending on the latter two.

Please hold to your promises before the 2007 election, and reassure your fellow Australians that we will be principled and courageous in setting a lead for the world. Think of how history and your grandchildren will judge you.

Please take SIGNIFICANT action now. Thank you -

Ann Duffy,

Accelerating warming evidence is from inputs 30 years ago -
Garnaud. Removing existing emissions is urgent task, as well as sensible
emission targets for the future such as 50:50 by 2020; and is achievable by
increasing soil carbon through methods of P.A. Yeomans known as "The Keyline
Plan" allied with soil science discoveries of Dr Christine Jones. If soil
carbon is increased in Earth's arable lands by only 2% this will be sufficient
to remove all of the excess carbon emissions of the last 150 years. GetUp must
aim this message at farmers, finance could come from legislating for all
Australian Superannuation investments to be directed to Australian
Infrastructure bonds.

Cam Bearlin, Kalaru

Please consider the following submission as part of the enquiry into climate change policy:

"Clean coal" is like "Dry Water".

I'm an old man but I have four grandchildren and I'm very concerned about the world they are going to inherit from us.

Let's get real about this. Let's listen to the science rather than the coal industry lobbyists.

Let's stop talking about "The Economy" as though the rest of Creation comes from it.

Let's understand that the economy is a sub-set of society and that society is a sub-set of the environment.

Let's understand that our economy can be changed to serve the greater good.

Let's understand that genuinely doing all we can to contribute to the international effort at Copenhagen is infinitely more "for the greater good" than propping up our coal industry for a few more years.

Let's have the gumption to do what we know is right.

Howard and his mob made me feel ashamed to be an Australian with their appalling performance at Kyoto; please don't make me ashamed to be Australian by undermining international agreements at Copenhagen.

The CPRS as it stands looks like it was designed by the big polluters for their benefit with all costs to be socialised.

In the light of what is publicly available knowledge, a target of 5-15% reduction in emissions is an affront to our collective intelligence. It is offensive!

Let's ensure we are down 50% on 1990 levels by 2020 and more than 90% by 2050.

Clean coal is like dry water.

Best regards
Carlos Whiley

No matter how great an economic policy government proceed with over the next 10 years, our future will clearly be dictated by our environment. If climate predictions take a grip on our fragile land and communities, then even a well governed country will fail. Look forward, make tough decisions and think about a sustainable future. Prevention must surely be better than cure !!

Phil Doley
Victor Harbor

Climate Change is here.

As a volunteer with the Great Barrier Reef Aquarium I am concerned with the impact on the reef. Scientific thinking is saying that CO2 levels are almost at tipping point and if we continue in this way the Reef will be gone inside 20 years at the most. That is almost NOW

Carbon Trading schemes, as suggested are a shuffling exercise and will only give the heavy polluters a licence to do more. A short term profit isn't going to help anyone, may not have time to spend it!

This government was voted in to Do something worthwhile
It is now almost past time.

Are you thinking about the planet your grand children will inherit.

The science is irrefutable.

Pat Kirkman (Mrs)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I urge this enquiry to recommend the federal government increase carbon reduction targets from 5-5% to 50% by 2020, before the U.N. Copenhagen Conference.

I feel that the present scheme over-compensates the major greenhouse gas polluters.

I urge the enquiry to recommend the government do more to truly encourage alternate and renewable energy industries; research and technology roll-outs.

We have now lost our last local photo-voltaic (solar energy) panel production: a travesty in light of our greenhouse situation.

We need strong leadership which rewards individual and small business initiatives that reduce emissions, regardless of the government's targets.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Edwards

To the Senate,

Before the election the Federal ALP, and Kevin Rudd in particular, said they believed the overwhelming scientific evidence when it came to climate change. Since the overwhelming scientific evidence says we need to cut greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50% to avoid catastrophic and irreversible climate change has the Government given up on the future of this planet or do they no longer believe the overwhelming scientific opinion?

Secondly, does the governments policy allow individuals to further reduce our country's emissions below the mandated targets, by cutting their own individual emissions? If not, why not?

Phil Bennett

The proposed 5% targets for greenhouse gas emissions is a poor policy and will indebt the next few generations to clean up the mess that this one is leaving as a legacy. Australia must demonstrate that it is a leader in this field, not a follower. The policy of seeing what other nations do first is a weak excuse for not acting.

Mr Rudd, please, rhetoric won't do here- real action is required and soon. Don't delay.

Frank Heimans

Dear Sir, Madam,

The present Government's 5-15% target is not in any way adequate for the world to avoid dangerous climate change facing all of us. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

New scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. And the Wilkes shelf in Antarctica has shattered and is now breaking off in large lumps.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form urgent international agreement. It 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's design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and our environment.

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

Because the CPRS imposes a lower level 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 urge you to take all these points into consideration when considering your next steps in the inquiry. It is most urgent

Jenny Saulwick

To whom it may concern,

Labor's election promise to combat climate change was the reason behind my vote for Kevin Rudd. Up until now Labo's response to climate change has been unacceptable and insignificant.

There are many reasons why the current climate policy must be changed. Listed below are just a few.

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

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

I urge your Government to listen to the public and make a significant impact to climate change.

Regards,
Olivia Bunny

Please make reversing climate change and conserving the natural environment and wild animal habitat your top priority. Do whatever it takes to rescue what is left of the natural environment and the climate that life on earth has evolved to suit. Please take the scientific evidence seriously and lead us strongly on this issue.

Thank you,
Janine Bjorkman

Dear Rudd Labor Government,

The 5-15% target for reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution is completely unacceptable. Please look beyond your term in government and commit to reducing by at least 50%. This is incredibly important for all citizens of Australia and the world.

Yours sincerely,

Penelope Pitt-Alizadeh

Hello,

My name is Ryan Anthony, and I'm not any sort of expert, but I do have strong beliefs about Australia's response to climate change.

I was excited when the Rudd government signed the Kyoto Protocol, but have been disappointed ever since at the weak targets and low aims.

Australia should have targets to irradiate Brown coal based electricity production, and set an emissions target of 50% of 1990 levels.

To the Australian Government,

I am embarrassed at the minimal target of 5-15% reduction in emissions on 1990 levels. I've always been proud to see and hear that Australia has been leading the way in multitudes of diverse fields, setting the examples for other countries to follow, but seeing this poor effort to commit to a decent target brings me shame and embarrassment. If the UK can commit to 20-30% reductions, how is it even possible that Australia is allowed such a pathetic attempt. We will practically make no difference, and more importantly, our hesitation, and unwillingness will only encourage similar behaviour from other countries following our sheepish example. The Arctic is disappearing as we speak - procrastination is not an option. THIS IS AN URGENT ISSUE! I feel like my government is not taking it seriously, afraid of facing consequences from industry that may be affected by the reductions target, instead of embracing the chance to make a difference for our future. Please, I urge you to weigh up the consequences. Forget about quick fixes that show results within the political term, let's make an effort. Increase the target to at least 50% emissions reduction by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Even if the changes become evident well after Mr Rudd has had his term, he will still be recognized as the pioneer Australian politician, willing to vote for our planet, our future. Hoping for change,
Cristel Chambers,

Submission to Senate Inquiry

It is clear, on the basis of advice from the bulk of the scientific community that the Government's 5-15% greenhouse target will not be adequate if we're going to significantly reduce the impact of climate change. The target needs to be increased to closer to the 50% by 2020 as recommended by the scientists. This would provide a lead to the international community and a demonstration of how serious Australia is about tackling this huge global problem.

The Government's proposed CPRS appears to be seriously flawed in that it offers polluting industry excessive compensation that will effectively encourage them to continue to pollute and generate greenhouse gases at great cost to the environment.

The encouragement of new growth industries in renewable energy needs to be made a very high priority and all practicle steps taken to refocus the Australian economy on renewable energy outcomes.

Greg Newton

I wish to make the following statement regarding the recent climate change targets made by our government. Firstly I voted for the current government because I believed that you would make some tough decisions that would ensure some action that would make a difference to our environment. I must say that I was disappointed to say least in the weak target set by our government. In these tough economic times is it not wise to rebuild the hard way why we are doing it tough. Lets build a positive future for our country. How can we expect other country's to do the right thing if we don't. Setting strong targets with well designed scheme's will ensure that Australia does it fair share and becomes world leaders in the future. No longer should be afraid of change look what has happened when we have followed others. LETS BE THE LEADERS IN THE FUTURE AND MAKE IT TOUGH WHILE TIMES ARE TOUGH WE WILL REAP THE BENEFITS IN THE FUTURE.

Yours

Victoria Pullen

The proposed CPRS is ill-conceived and must better reflect the strong desire of the local and international community to effectively engage in the processes by which we can all reduce carbon pollution.

Australia has a chance. Setting a strong example to other G20 nations will demonstrate our ability to be international leaders and expose our willingness to be a part of the inevitable ecological development of the future.

The same is also true of any weak example, and there is no argument as to how this CPRS will be classified.

Please.

Sincerely,

Chris Endrey.

The people of Australia clearly voted for change and action. So far we have been cheated. So, get on with it.

Set meaningful targets, stop bowing to big industry and grow a spine. This is probably the most important decision you will ever make and you have a chance to make a difference. I want to make a difference but your scheme fails to allow me to. I don't want my children to grow up in the kind of environment the current policies are steering us towards.

Just get on and do this right; we are getting tired of the typical political bull.

S.Greasley

I read with utter dismay yesterday the collapse of some Antarctic Ice sheets, with experts predicting the demise of the West Antarctic sheet during this century. How much more information do you need to START ACTION NOW!! This is our planet and you do nothing. Year after year, nothing substantial. Just continuous talk. It is my right to have a sustainable environment. That should be your prime directive! I am doing as much as I can and more. Consider this: the 2 kilowatt Solar PV system I installed on our house that is being built, has just passed the production of 1.1 megawatts in 3 months!!! What if 1 million households had a similar system? That is a lot of free, non-carbon producing electricity over summer! Please give everyday Australians some assistance to do something, and the government a big broad target, like Mr Obama is doing for the US.

regards
chris

To whom it may concern

I am writing to you to voice my concerns over the suggested 5% target to reduce global emissions. Quite clearly this is no where near enough. We should be aiming for 50% by 2020. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Many new scientific findings show that climate change is happening. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. Only yesterday the news reported of a huge ice shelf that has fractured away from the main ice pack. Climate change is really and is happening as you read my email.

I'm calling on you to improve the CPRS as currently it is badly designed and will do more harm than good.

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

I feel without the lead of the Australian Government, families and individuals are helpless in making any real dent in emissions - the lead needs to come from you. Prove to the Australian people that you care about our future and our next generations, our wildlife and our environments. Listen to your voters voice and make this necessary change.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Kind regards

Sue Littleton

I am concerned that not enough is being done, quickly enough, to prevent the catastrophic effects of climate change. Humans have a responsibility to one another and to the other species on this planet to reduce carbon emissions wherever possible.

As an Australian citizen, I urge our government to take urgent action to reduce Australia's carbon footprint. By setting a strong target (50% by 2020, on 1990 levels) within a well-designed CPRS, we will ensure Australia contributes fairly to the fight against climate change, provide opportunities for growth in the renewable energy industry, and provide a strong example for other countries to follow.

Please let me know what improvements the government is prepared to make on its stated climate policies, and by when. I look forward to further information on this critical issue.

Warren Hope

To whom it may concern,

Having given Rudd and the Labor party my vote in the election due to an apparently tough stance on climate change I was appalled, dismayed and disheartened at the weak targets they released.

Australia, like few other nations in the world is in a good position to make a strong stance and lead the world towards a sustainable future. Instead the current Rudd stance is undermining a global consensus and selling out Australia's future. With issues like climate change, similar to the economic crisis, we need global leadership - Rudd seems to be able to deliver global leadership on one issue but seems unwilling or unable to commit himself to showing leadership on a more permanent and long term issue. Please for every bodies sake stop living with a vision on election cycles.

I personally act every day to try and minimise my own ecological footprint, but ultimately my attempts are nothing without strong overarching leadership. If Rudd cannot shake up his policies and show a backbone on such an important issue I certainly will not be casting a labour vote come the next election.

I trust that my voice will be heard and considered (unlike many who do not have the privilege of living in a democracy, but who will be affected severely by climate change). As a developed nation we have an obligation to demonstrate leadership - something we are currently failing dismally at.

Thank you,

Tom Marwick

Dear Minister,

I am writing to ask you to take the strongest possible action to avoid dangerous climate change.

I am willing to make the significant lifestyle changes required to slow, and ultimately halt, climate change including paying more for the direct and indirect energy I consume. I know that this will not be easy but I believe that it is a responsibility that must be carried by our generation.

I encourage you to take leading steps to steer our economy towards renewable energy, and I ask you to set a stronger target than currently proposed by the Australian government.

I believe that many Australians are willing to make sacrifices to halt dangerous climate change, and ask you to make bold decisions on our behalf - despite the political risks such decisions entail.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request,

Sincerely,
Robin Merrick (0418 475 238)

Climate change is set to have a huge impact on the lives of generations to come. Please, please take a stronger stand on the issue of Climate change by increasing our targets for the reduction of carbon emissions to 50% by 2020.

The young people of Australia are prepared to make changes in order to reduce the impacts of climate change worldwide. Please support us in our efforts by setting ambitious but achievable targets.

The Earth. Ignore it. And it will go away.

I am hopeful for the future.

Yours sincerely,

Ellen Sweeney. 17 yrs old.

Get real and get us all on your side to get this climate change problem sorted. Humans love a big challenge - just look at what happened during the fires recently. We need big money spent on what it will take to turn this burning ship around. We will admire you for your leadership. Give us something to really get our teeth into. And that includes big business and those that are profiting from producing our dirty energy.

Elizabeth

We are seeing unprecedented changes in our environment due to climate change. We have known about this since the 1970's, and still in 2009, Australia is hoping that hiding its head in the sand will make it go away. The fact is , that if we continue to do nothing (or very little) , we will not have a world to live in, so trying to save carbon industry jobs will be a flawed road travelled. The future is "green industries", any thinking person can see this. I am so sick and tired of listening to more and more politalk, when the only way to make any difference is to reduce carbon emissions by at least 20% not 5%. Please, think of the people (my children) who will have to deal with the earth after you have retired from politics, and are enjoying your tax-payer funded pensions, superannuation and travel schemes (probably carbon-guzzling and emitting). That place will be a very poor comparison to the earth I and other baby-boomers have grown up in. We remember fast-running rivers, deluges of rain, and species of animals and birds which are endangered, or no longer in existence. Politicians of all persuasions have let us down badly. As I said in an email to John Howard 3 years ago: "Just DO SOMETHING!"

Liz Mackie

Firstly, I want to commend the Rudd government for having a climate change policy in the first place. This is a vast improvement on the policies of the Howard government.

However, I wish to emphasise my belief, in the strongest possible terms, that the proposed 5-15% target is simply too little, too late.

It is my understanding that this target will serve merely to undermine collective international agreement thus far, in the face of December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Further, the CPRS currently proposed by the government I believe does little to ensure the main polluters in Australia are in any way persuaded to alter their practices. On top of this, as I and many like me are committing to private grid-connect home installations it is with the greatest disbelief that we are led to believe that we are in fact indirectly SUPPORTING both big industry AND the government's weak targets by doing so.

Surely policy-change in terms of refocussing our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy makes sound economic sense? Likewise, is this not preferable to the current 'status quo': Renewable Industry 'brain-drain' and profitable technology moving offshore?

Thanks for your time.

Matt Pritchard

I'm sorry, people, but this 5-15% target is clearly the stance of someone who does not want to make a hard decision. You HAVE to know the danger of being this spineless. Apart from embarrassing and disappointing the constituents who wanted you to honestly represent them, you undermine the momentum of the global push required to act dynamically, as the situation demands. Can I urge you to also consider your mortification and bitter self disappointment felt if you have to look back in the future at a self who betrayed its civilization in a crunch, and failed to rise above their fears to be a true leader. Don't be mediocre - please have a REAL go. I know you all mean well - let us all have the courage to DO well - Warwick.

I have never been swayed by the crisis of the day - Y2K, bird flu, etc etc etc. But climate change is too big to ignore - the consequences of inaction are too dire for us and the generations who follow us.

Conventional economic arguments are based on the short-term vision that consuming resources (including by polluting our environment) this year is more important than saving those resources for the long term.

Serious targets need to be set, not trivial ones. We need to lead the world, not wait for developing countries to catch up. I am very dubious that an ETS will have true value, but will instead become a means for polluters to dodge responsibility for investing in cleaner technologies, while allowing a new industry in dodgy offsets to spring up to employ the financial wizzkids and spivs who have done so much for the global financial system

Richard Scott

Just to say that although I would have voted for a Labor Govt anyway, I am somewhat disappointed (along the lines of Mungo MacCallum in the last "Monthly") in the way that climate policy seems to have been pushed back almost to invisibility. There is a huge amount this Govt. can do about this without losing sight of the need to deal with the economy. The Prime Minister needs to take notice of how Obama is taking on the auto manufacturers. You won't lose the next election by being aggressive on this – only if you continue to be piss weak.

Ian Nowak

Another northern Summer begins, and with it, the frightening rate of sea ice melt is clear for us all to see.

In Australia we have greenhouse pollution reduction targets which are so low they show us to be a pitiful 'developed' global citizen.

Australia MUST instigate a MINIMUM 50% greenhouse pollution reduction target by 2020 and a CPRS which demonstrates a genuine intent to act rather than present a cosmetic policy which is sympathetic to the worst polluters.

We MUST NOT legislate like Luddites. We MUST move immediately, and with absolute federal conviction, to seed and grow 21st Century technologies. We MUST see our youth given every opportunity to embrace change. They need not fear the future if the Senate prepares the way for them to make today's alternatives tomorrow's conventions.

By LEADING, Australia's decision makers can both ensure the security of generations to follow, as well as apply pressure to our global partners.

I respectfully urge the Senators to apply pressure to the Government to amend its greenhouse pollution reduction policy and embrace the exciting challenge of developing a MODERN economy.

Respectfully,

Greg Murray

I am writing regard the 5-15% reduction target that the government is proposing, which is clearly inadequate in order to avoid dangerous climate change. A reduction in greenhouse pollution of 50% would be nearer what is needed, given that new scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than was predicted.

The weak target that the government is proposing is not only inadequate but is undermining efforts to form an international agreement at the UN Conference in Copenhagen.

The CPRS is an ineffective and poorly designed scheme that will do more harm, not less. I have just installed pv panels in order to lessen the impact I make on the environment, but what is the point if the big polluters are simply allowed to continue to increase their emissions?

I believe that setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will not only ensure that we do our fair share but will refocus our economy to one that is based on renewable energy, and is genuinely sustainable.

Yours sincerely

Megan Wynne-Jones

I am concerned that this figure is still so low. With recent news about the arctic ice shelves breaking apart much faster than previously expected, surely some alarm bells are ringing.

Whether you do believe that our reaction is alarmist or not, certain occurrences in our natural world are indicating that something is not right and that we need to change the way we do things. The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is not the answer. It still allows the biggest polluters to get away with what they're doing.

Australia needs to be an example. We need to propose and commit to a 50% drop in greenhouse pollution by 2020.

Yes, it does require changing the mindset and habits of a nation and of many cultures within that nation. But it makes sense and it can be done.

5-15% is not even trying.

Faithfully

Diana Condylas

Please take note of recent changes around the world that are a warning to us all, such as the breaking up of the Wilkens Ice Shelf, and aim for larger cuts and more rapid action to reduce carbon release.

Strong words need strong actions, and to date I have been bitterly disappointed with the Rudd Govts big talking but low action policies on environmental issues!

regards
Sue Dowson

Hello,

Australia is a country vulnerable to climate change. Our agricultural and tourism industries are susceptible to destruction if we do not act meaningfully to minimise CO2 emissions. The Government's 5-15% target does not go far enough.

Australia should show the rest of the world that we are serious about protecting our natural heritage and sustainable industries. A reduction of 50% from 1990 levels by 2020 is needed for this.

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is too lenient on the industries which are the worst polluters and does not recognise actions taken by individuals and small businesses. The level of compensation polluters will currently receive is too high.

I urge this inquiry to make it clear to the Government that we need stronger targets than what are proposed.

Sincerely,

Sophia Christoe.

At a base minimum we should commit ourselves - government, industry, individuals - to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution during the coming 10 years by 50% on 1990 levels.

It is important to strengthen our targets before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Government widely over-compensates polluters at the expense of the rest of the community - and indeed of the environment.

I urge a rapid U turn in Government policy, the present one is hardly distinguishable from that of Johnny Howard.

John Prior

The world is in a serious environmental state. Australians contribute significantly to that state. The Australian government has the power to reduce Australia's carbon emissions significantly by providing strong leadership and significant achievable targets. By this means, Australia has the power to be a world leader and to create and encourage innovative industries and jobs which contribute to a better, cleaner, healthier world.

The Government's 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. The target needs to be higher and more realistic to achieve the goals. This is particularly important as recent scientific findings demonstrate that climate change is happening more quickly than previously thought.

The December UN Conference on Climate Change is the opportunity for Australia to show that it is a leader and a supporter of a crucial international agreement. Australia can do this by setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure we do our fair share to avoid dangerous climate change and to refocus our economy to take advantage of renewable energy growth industries. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme needs to encourage individuals and small businesses to reduce energy. Setting a weak target of 5-15% will make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Be a leader in a field which will benefit not only Australians and create Australian jobs, but which will set Australia apart as a country committed to a better world.

E. Faye Smith