

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I know it is an “inconvenient truth”, but it seems that reducing carbon emissions is a very important step for all world governments to take.

There are several ways to do this, and there are targets to aim for. A mere 5% is not enough on the world stage to prevent a climate catastrophe. If the whole world followed such a weak example the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will increase, causing unstoppable climate changes. Aiming for a 40% reduction, by 2020, is a more realistic means of stopping this disaster.

Compensating polluters and an unfair emissions trading scheme that negates the efforts homeowners and other small businesses make to reduce emissions, does nothing to encourage big polluting businesses to invest in long term emission reducing plans. It is such a short-sighted and short-term idea. And yes, it might win some votes. But at what cost? The world? Your children's future? Their children's future?

An emissions trading scheme is just one of the tools to reduce Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. But there are other tools in its toolbox, such as a mandatory renewable energy target, a renewable energy feed-in tariff, energy efficiency standards for homes and commercial buildings, fuel efficiency standards and investment in trains, buses and trams. Ending the logging of Australia's native forests would reduce Australia's emissions by substantially more than 5%. All these policies should be pursued regardless of the CPRS.

Please look at the science of this situation, not the politics. Listen to the experts who offer their advice to you during this inquiry, listen to the people of Australia and make the right decision in your recommendations.

What we have now, is worse than useless – it only encourages the worst offenders to go on offending.

Name: Mary Louise Stammers