

To whom it may concern,

I write as a concerned Australian citizen to submit my views for consideration by the Senate Committee on the issue of the government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

In its current form, the CPRS is fatally flawed and should not be allowed to pass unless modified in the following ways:

- The scheme needs to adopt at least the minimum scientific targets. Anything less, makes the scheme not worth the paper it is printed on. Under the government's current proposal, we lose the Great Barrier Reef, the Murray-Darling Basin and Kakadu National Park. And we lose the economies based on them. Australia can't afford that kind of sacrifice. More importantly though, we tie ourselves to a completely unscientific target that, in practice, is as good as doing nothing at all.
- The scheme needs to allow people to take voluntary action on climate change above and beyond any stated target. As it currently stands, any action I take as an individual, will merely contribute to our measley and inadequate 5% target and make it cheaper for the big polluters to pollute. The Australian populace is ready and prepared to do its bit for the good of our country and our future. (e.g. 84% of Victorians stated that they are prepared to take action on the environment in a recent study conducted by Sustainability Victoria). The polluters MUST be made to do theirs. I want my actions to mean something and to help progress our fight against climate change. Under this scheme, I will merely be putting money back in the pockets of the very dirty and the very rich big business-interests for them to keep doing exactly what got us into this situation in the first place! It is a complete disincentive to those of us who are willing to act and a total misplacement of justice for the government to ask the Australian people to continue making sacrifices on the one hand, while slipping the big polluters millions of our dollars with the other.
- For this reason also I object vehemently to so much of my tax payer money being awarded to big polluters as compensation in the form of free permits. By implementing energy and water efficiency measures, many of these companies could actually save money and do their part for our environment at the same time. I object to our political process being hijaked by the prophets-of-doom of the polluting lobby and ask that the Senate Committee consider the actual figures and facts as modeled by Treasury itself. There are two facts I would bring to the Committee's attention (as outlined by Guy Pearce in his recent Quarterly Essay: "Quarry Vision"):
 - o Very little of Australia's economy is exposed to carbon pricing. Treasury's models have shown that in almost every Australian industry (including quarry), there would be continued growth under a strong carbon scheme. The difference is it would be cleaner and larger in 2050 than it is today. This does not sound like the economic doom being forecast by vested business interests who are prepared to sacrifice our collective future on the altar of the status-quo. Noone now would argue that we should watching videos on BETA rather than DVD, yet these business interests are prepared to stand not

only in the way of our environmental good but our future economic progress and prosperity to line their own pockets in the short-term.

- The chances of carbon leakage, in addition, are small. The chance that companies will uproot and shift their entire Australian operations due to a slightly lower rate of return in the short term is nil. It would be too costly and makes no business sense. Rather, they would look for long term efficiencies and in the process will not only grow more prosperous but do their part to meet the challenge of climate change. I ask that the Senate Committee exercise its power and force the government to look beyond the childish threats of the polluting lobby.
- The scheme also needs to limit the amount of international offsetting allowed to 10%. While globally it makes little difference, allowing unlimited international offsetting – as the current scheme does – will simply mean Australia loses out on any economic opportunities that could be gained. It is also hard to monitor the quality of these international offsets and to speak for their efficiency.

These are, in my opinion, the very minimum changes that must be made to the scheme for it to warrant serious Senate consideration. Otherwise, I would ask that my representatives send it back to the government's drawing board and ask them to start again – only this time, with a scheme that will actually work.

I would also ask the Senate Committee to investigate the carbon lobby's undue influence on this process and demand that the government restores fairness and transparency to its consultation. I pay my taxes and I pay my bills. I refuse to pay a third time for the self-interested, short-sighted lobby currently running rampant over our political representatives.

Yours sincerely,

Vicki Kyriakakis