

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

The currently proposed emissions trading scheme has lost sight of the reason argued for the existence of any such scheme: this is, as we all know, or did before we got lost in the CPRS details, to reduce Australia's carbon pollution, and hence contribute to the slowing or halting of global warming.

It is deeply distressing to many Australians, especially grandparents like myself who may not live to see a better world for our grandchildren than the terrible one they now face, that the government's CPRS is so much worse than the tokenism previously employed. It will not do one thing to encourage the high carbon emitting industries like coal power and aluminium to reduce their pollution, since most are being offered free permits to pollute.

And buying offsets overseas is an economic sidestepping that such companies can well afford and does nothing to address the cause of the global crisis: their carbon emissions. In other countries the power and aluminium industries are using renewables like hydro and geo-thermal to run their industries because they have no choice: why are we giving them this choice here, postponing the inevitable, when it is so damaging to us all?

Coal is still dictating climate change policy and we have no time for that anymore. Using market measures like this ought to be making toxic industries more expensive to run so that renewables can compete at last and surge forward to replace them. The same companies could make their profits cleanly if government had the will to insist they do so, instead of propping them up and compensating them as this CPRS does.

If they choose not to change, then, like the asbestos industry, they must wind down and cease harming us all. Did government listen to James Hardie above all else then? No.

The CPRS does not equally support the renewable energy industries, which, if they had true government backing, whether by high mandatory targets and market measures or by direct support as the coal industry gets, we would be 'powering' ahead with. This could be the economic and employment saviour of the country as well as the way to halt global warming.

This world crisis is escalating at rates no scientist had predicted. The future is not coal and the government is still too in thrall to the industry lobbyists to admit that we have no time to wait on a 'maybe, one day solution' like 'clean coal' – currently as much mere wishful thinking as "safe nuclear".

Other countries have already seen their green futures as essential both economically and environmentally and have been seizing the opportunity to profit from it and set in place the power infrastructure needed ; more, like the U.S. are now looking to join them. If we are not to be left behind even further, polluting shamefully and suffering economically, Australia must look at what is needed, not what is wanted by the industries at fault.

Any measure like this scheme can only be a small part of the steps taken in the face of such threats, but this one will not fulfil its aims to: i. reduce carbon pollution at the lowest economic cost, ii. put in place long-term incentives for investment in clean energy and low-emission technology, and iii. contribute to a global solution to climate change;

We need to be pushing ahead with genuine incentives and legislation on energy efficiency, feed-in tariffs, and reduction of native forest clearing – our own, not Indonesia's! 'Do as I say, not as I do'?

We must NOT lock ourselves in to the ludicrous and equally useless emissions target of 5%; wait until after Poznan and it will be clear that our stance is shockingly lacking. Australians – the

people, not just the profiteers – will get behind a government that takes a brave and realistic stand here and post-Poznan they will have support for that. If we have followed America for so long, to our discredit, let us do it now with justified purpose as Obama shows the way.

Objective science should have the government's ear and government must find a way to implement what they say is essential to avoid runaway climate chaos: they are not saying 5%, or 15%; more like 40% by 2020.

'There are no profits on a dead planet', as the sticker truly says.

By setting a strong target and sending a price signal to the market, a well-designed emissions trading scheme would help dramatically reduce our emissions at least cost to the economy and make sure we do our fair share to tackle climate change. This badly designed emissions trading scheme will be worse than useless, with its pathetically weak target and its over-compensation of polluters at the expense of community, environment and the progress of renewables.

Please look at the science of this situation, not the politics. 'Better than nothing', as Ms Wong says, is not good enough and we have no time to waste by taking backward steps as this scheme will encourage.

Name: Sharyn Munro