

Dear Committee "Inquiry into Save our solar (Solar rebate protection) Bill,

a) & d) I've seen reports in the local paper that 2 of the major Canberra installers in Canberra have lost work and that at least one has had to lay off staff because of the rebate cap. This is not going to stimulate renewable industries.

b) & j) There should be no cap. Anyone at all who wants to generate green electricity should be encouraged to do so if we want our cities to become solar powered more quickly. If it is viable for UK to become solar powered surely we in Australia should be able to do it. We need to change over to renewable energy as soon as possible.

Using my household as a case study, our PV system would have cost \$23,000 without the \$8,000 rebate. This system wasn't the cheapest one because it incorporates an inverter that allows us to expand our system later. If you want a dirt cheap system you get no flexibility to expand when you manage to save up more. Getting a cheaper system that doesn't allow you to expand later is obviously not in the interests of encouraging solar production. There's no way we could have afforded our PV system without the rebate (note our family jointly earns over \$100,000). I've saved for 3 years on a part time wage, sacrificing many other things our family would like (eg, we can now no longer afford to update our 1970's kitchen - not many families would put PV's ahead of a new kitchen). Perhaps DINKs could afford it but average families, who are concerned about the world they are leaving for their kids (so have an added incentive to install PV systems), will struggle to afford PVs with or without rebates.

While I'm against a cap, if there has to be a cap it should be at least \$150,000 as this is what parenting allowance limit has been raised to - if a family can't survive without help on less than \$150k, then they can't afford to buy PV cells on an income less than that either.

k) a recent ACF report claimed that (collective) government investments total \$5,379 million in fossil fuels and \$126 million in renewable energy. I searched out the original report: http://www.acfonline.org.au/uploads/res/govt_investment.pdf

It's obvious that until those two figures are reversed, the government has every disincentive to act decisively on climate change.

If the government has a deliberate policy of investing in renewable energy as opposed to fossil fuels, we are more likely to get progressive government policy favouring a switch to a low carbon economy.

As it is, I'm wondering, if the government structures the renewable rebate so that no-one can take advantage of it, what do they do with the unused money? I hope it is not invested in fossil fuels. This money should definitely be "parked" in renewable investments while it is waiting for people to use it.

Caroline Wenger.