

Hi,

I have just read the draft legislation of the CPRS and it has many flaws. Firstly, the 5-15% target is too low. Australia need to cut emissions by at least 40% from the 1990 levels if we are to play a full part in the global response to climate change.

Secondly, there is no emissions cap on

- \* Australian emissions units provided by the Government at a fixed price (Part 2 s13)
- \* Australian emissions units created by eligible reforestation projects (Part 10)
- \* International emissions units traded into the Australian scheme (Part 4)

Thirdly, there is nothing in the Exposure Draft that limits the proportion of free permits that can be given away to emissions-intensive trade-exposed industries.

Fourthly, coal power need to be phased out. Any assistance provided to coal fired power stations under the CPRS needs to be contingent on phase-out plans. This is not evident in the draft.

Fifthly, reforestation projects under the CPRS do not exclude logging and can be "offsets" for industrial emissions.

Lastly, the legislation indicated that decisions against polluting entities are reviewable, but decisions in favour of them are not. This is an outrageous proposal as it excludes third parties from being able to take civil or administrative action for breaches of the CPRS Act or against decisions made under the Act. Third party prosecutions have made a significant contribution to environmental and social law in Australia, and given the immense importance of this Bill for the future of Australian society, it is vital that third party rights be established under any CPRS Act.

I expect that these flaws will be taken into consideration and amended.

Tegan Mossop

Tegan Mossop