

28 MAY 2009

RECEIVED	
DATE	BY

Sophie received
in Canberra,
12/05/09

Harry & Bev Elliffe

1:

9th. April 2009.

Senator Christine Milne,
Parliament House,
Canberra, ACT.

Attn. John Hawkins
Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

Dear Senator Milne,

I read that the deadline for submissions to the Senate Enquiry into the CPRS has closed.

I regret that I have been away for a period and have not had time to prepare a submission, but I attach a recent letter that I sent to Senator Wong as a protest.

I would appreciate it if this could be included in the Senate Enquiry, as I feel that the current scheme is very poorly targeted, and will need considerable modification to be effective.

The Senate appears to be the last hope for Australia's stand in this important matter.

Dear Senator Wong,

I have serious concerns about the Proposed CPRS bill about to be put to Parliament. There are serious flaws in the proposed bill, which will need modification for the Bill to be effective.

1. Under the proposed Bill with the 5% target in 2020, emissions-intensive industries will receive 45% of the available permits for free. This represents a massive handout to big polluters that will not stimulate change in their unsustainable practices.
2. A perverse outcome of setting a cap in an attempt to reduce our overall emissions is that each tonne of greenhouse gases saved by the community in their voluntary reduction efforts, translates into an additional tonne of pollution available for the big polluters. This needs modification if there is to be any serious activity by private citizens and businesses as their efforts in reducing their emissions will simply free up permits for the larger polluters such as coal fired power stations.
3. The most obvious flaw is the reduction target of 5-15% on 2000 levels by 2020. This target is painfully low and will lock in Australia's contribution to dangerous climate change.
4. Carbon pollution permits have been created as personal property rights. This means that polluting 'property holders' have the right to be compensated under any future attempts to change the CPRS. Creating the 'right to pollute' also means that we will be privatising a global good - the atmosphere.

5. There is no limit on international credits for domestic obligations. This means that instead of reducing their own emissions, polluters can invest in projects overseas that claim to emit fewer emissions than they would without the investment (offset projects). Many of these projects have dubious benefits for the environment, and business will carry on as usual in Australia.

The scheme seems to have been heavily loaded towards the coal and high pollution industries, and I feel that it will do little to reduce the overall carbon reduction in the atmosphere.

I realise that this is an extremely difficult period to be considering this important measure, but it is essential that we try to improve the world conditions for the next generations.

Yours faithfully,
Harry Elliffe,

