

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

The scheme proposed by the Government appears to have been dictated by the big polluters. If the scheme was better designed then it would be ONE tool in our attempt to reduce our carbon emissions. Emissions trading is one of many important tools the government can use to reduce Australia's emissions. By setting a strong target and sending a price signal to the market, a well-designed scheme should help dramatically reduce Australia's emissions at the least cost to the economy and make sure Australia does its fair share to tackle climate change. However, a badly designed emissions trading scheme will prevent the economic transformation Australia needs, at a cost to both the economy and the environment.

The Government has not made enough of the employment opportunities in the so called "green industries" such as

1. energy efficiency. There is need for the subsidy scheme to instal insulation to be given a higher profile and better subsidies. There is need to make it mandatory for all commercial buildings to complete energy audits and carry out the recommendations from such an audit. In the 1970s the Southern California power company was persuaded by a group of people to GIVE each householder energy efficient light bulbs rather than build a new power station .The result was not only did the company not have to go to the huge expence of a new power station but it made a profit.

2. production of more wind generators by Australian industry to install here and export overseas. Recently Spain generated for a day or two 70% of their power supply from wind. We are so far behind countries in Europe that it is a disgrace. In the early 1970s an engineer with ETSA (South Australia) devised and costed a scheme to built wind generators at Whyalla and instal them on the west coast of SA. Of course this was too radical and was rejected by the Government

3. it has been pointed out by Dr Kaye Green MP NSW that the replacement of broken electrical hot water heaters by solar heaters would save a large amount of power- in several years enough to take a coal fired powered station off line. There is need to make it mandatory for this to occur and subsidies paid to ensure that the replacement of a electrical heater with solar would not cost any more than a new electric model. Such heaters would be boosted by gas not electricity. These subsidies will cost a deal of money but the employment generated from the boost to these industries would offset them and possibly the dirty industries which choose to go off shore.

4. the installation of photovoltaic solar cells have been taken up enthusiastically by the public who can afford to pay the extra cost -perhaps up to \$5,000- If the subsidy was increased then there would be an even larger market for solar cell manufacture in Australia and more employment for installers. A firm in Adelaide has commissioned a new factory to produce a new kind of solar cell much smaller and in due course cheaper than the existing ones. When production commences there should be a ready market for them. There is need to follow Germany's lead in paying a decent price on gross production for power generated by the householders cells. In Germany this has resulted in a very large increase in generation of power by cells. Why are we so reluctant to take up new ideas ?

5. 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.

The threat by the large polluters to go off shore should not be taken at face value. The cost of establishing new aluminium smelters in some other country would be huge and the company would need to find a country willing to have them. Miners cannot move the mines.

VOLUNTARY REDUCTIONS

In addition to setting such a weak 5% target, the CPRS also fails to take into account voluntary emission reductions from the community. The efforts of everyone from householders to State Governments to reduce emissions will be helpful only in reducing the price pressure on polluters. This must be fixed by taking account of community action and all the policies already in place when setting the scheme caps, and using the scheme to drive more ambitious efforts.

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.

Climate Change Minister Penny Wong has described the CPRS as 'better than nothing', but she is wrong. It is worse than useless.

Australia needs a strong, ambitious and fair emissions trading scheme, not a plan that protects polluters and stands in the way of the change we need.

Name: James Tedder