

I am concerned that under the proposed CPRS any voluntary action I take as an individual or as part of my community will have no effect on reducing Australia's emissions. In fact, from what I understand, the more effort I make to reduce my emissions, the more permits will be available to the big polluters, who, will already be receiving highly subsidised permits because for some reason it's ok for them to pollute? This concern is not only a concern for myself and my community. This concern stretches to those in the developing world who have hardly contributed to the current climate crisis but who will suffer the consequences far more acutely than we in Australia will. I find this somewhat disturbing and trust that you also will take into account those, less fortunate, with whom we share our planet, when you consider the CPRS. Thankyou for your time.

Hannah Hancock

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is flawed and will have no effect

on halting the effects of run away climate change.

The governments proposal of a carbon cap between 5%-15% is much too low. Currently communities are already facing the devastating effects of climate change. The People of the Carterets Islands are already losing their homes and livelihoods with the Atolls disappearing under the rising sea levels created by

the massive co2 emissions created by rich nations in particular Australia. It is

our duty to provide strong carbon reduction targets and lead the way for other nations. The government needs to commit to at least a 40% reduction of carbon emissions on 1990 levels immediately if there is any chance of keeping emissions

at manageable levels.

The allocation of free permits to high polluting industries is an absolute joke. It encourages polluting and does nothing to reduce emissions. As it stands, high polluting industries such as coal and aluminium have free rein to pollute, and with no cap on the permits, there is nothing to encourage carbon intensive businesses to clean up their act and focus on renewable methods. The permit system as it is recommended does nothing to raise revenue for the renewable industry which is what is needed.

There needs to be a phase out of the coal industry and a clean up of other high

pollution industries if we hope to have any impact on reducing the effects of climate change.

In summary, the proposed CPRS Scheme is highly flawed and will have no effect on climate change.

Angela Nagle

I write to you concerning my concerns about flaws in the Exposure Draft legislation for the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme:

The 5-15% target is too low.

There is no emissions cap.

Assistance to coal-fired generators should be contingent on a phase-out plan.

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

There are no third party rights.

Thank you for your attention.

The number of free units to be issued to EITEs is not capped

Anthony Samperi

Submission on CPRS

There are many problems with this CPRS.

Do we really want it to be useful? The targets are way too low. The White Paper stated the Treasury modelling of those targets with a \$25 /tonne initial carbon price to be consistent with a scenario stabilising at 550ppm CO2 equivalent. Science getting increasingly out of date presents a 2 degree temperature rise at 450ppm. Clearly it is crazy to have such low targets, no emissions cap and to fail to play a serious role in the international response from developed countries.

It is increasingly evident that the impact of global warming from our past greenhouse gases emissions is going to be hard to cope with, let alone what the consequences of our future emissions is going to be. Following the Garnaut report and a modicum of common sense, 40% reductions from 1990 levels, is the least we should have as a target for CPR.

It is ridiculous that there is no emissions cap. It is bad enough that there are free emissions units to coal-fired generators but absurd that Australian emission units created by eligible reforestation projects (Exposure Draft, Part 10) are not limited.

There is simply no way that Australian emissions will be reduced under this structure and there is a real risk that all of our cuts will be pushed off-shore, to forestry offsets in the developing world and dubious Clean Development Mechanism projects.

There should be limits on the number of international units a facility and/or person can purchase to meet their pollution cuts. The number of free units to be issued to EITs is not capped. Assistance to coal-fired generators should be contingent on a phase-out plan. This is the absolute minimalist realistic approach to coal as an energy source. IT HAS TO GO.

Reforestation projects under the CPRS do not exclude logging and can be "offsets" for industrial emissions. The scheme can (and will) be flooded with cheap credits provided for free beyond the cap to people growing forests, who will then be able to harvest those forests for timber unless the Regulations specifically prevent it. Any vegetated area that is set aside for a carbon sink - thus providing a source of income for the landholder via the CPRS - must not be allowed to be disturbed by logging or grazing.

In short:

The 5-15% target is too low.

There is no emissions cap.

The CPRS fails to reduce carbon pollution.

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

There are no third party rights

The Australian CPRS as written in the Exposure Draft must catch up with the rate of change. Dealing with the impacts of global warming through the responsible use of power by being in government is not really a political issue - I think it is a spiritual issue. I'm praying, I hope you are receiving my loving energy.

Marg McLean

There are so many flaws in the proposed CPRS. It is essentially an excuse for companies to benefit from climate change, while the rest of the world burns.

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.

Even the 90% give-away proposed in the White Paper may end up being increased. Every free permit given to a polluting company means less money raised through the auction system will be available to compensate householders and invest in much-needed renewable energy development. The wealthy industries that have profited from pollution must be made, like everyone else, to pay their way in a carbon constrained world.

Reforestation projects under the CPRS do not exclude logging and can be "offsets" for industrial emissions

The scheme can (and will) be flooded with cheap credits provided for free beyond the cap to people growing forests, who will then be able to harvest those forests for timber unless the Regulations specifically prevent it.

The irreversibility of climate change demands that we be precautionary and that we make every effort available to reduce emissions and draw down atmospheric carbon. Any vegetated area that is set aside for a carbon sink - thus providing a source of income for the landholder via the CPRS - should not be allowed to be disturbed by logging or grazing.

Sincerely,
Alexander Dickson

5% not enough - come on private residents are trying harder than that. this is critical to our children and it will be easy to convince people...people WANT THIS make it happen.

Andrew Barnard

The proposed emissions trading scheme will not work. The target of 5-15% is much too low. Australia must take a lead in the world. Ice is melting and in Australia we see many years of unusual drought, fire, flood which scientific evidence shows is likely to be because of man made climate change.

- **Coal based power should be phased out starting immediately**
- **there should be a cap on the limit of free permits for emissions intensive industries**
- **there should be a cap on Australian emissions**
- **third party rights should be established under any carbon pollution reduction scheme.**

Carolyn Kinloch-Rees

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am concerned that the proposed Emission Trading Scheme will end up being a dog's breakfast with too many companies finding loopholes in the scheme. Far preferable would be that the government simply legislate caps on carbon emissions. The electorate must surely be of a mind to accept this with alarm about global warming spreading and the wish to see polluters reined in.

Yours faithfully,

Margaret Gibberd

I am absolutely dismayed at the very low target of 5-15%. The extremely serious climate change situation in the world, including the threats to many nations from rising sea levels, demands that Australia play a much stronger role along with other nations in greatly reducing the effects of carbon emissions. I urge you to raise the target considerably; also to set a timetable for the phase-out of polluting coal energy sources.

Beverley Symons

This bill should not be made into law as it sets the targets too low, there is no emission cap, and there are no 3rd party rights.

Rebecca Mutton

This scheme is woefully inadequate in the face of the urgency of global warming situation. This scheme lags far behind the needs of the environment, legislation is needed to initiate and support renewable technological solutions. The emissions reduction target needs to be at least 25%.

Sally Gillespie

The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 are piss weak, at this rate we may as well just kiss our asses goodbye. Everyone needs to do the most they can on climate change if we want a chance at even surviving the next century, and as some of the biggest per-capita polluters in the world, Australians need to and can be making the biggest cuts, especially our big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else, the way they have with the economic crisis. Besides, sound studies have shown that strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy. This is our best chance of surviving the current economic 'shit storm' and the far worse environmental one that is to come.

Yours Sincerely,
Frank Deveson

I am so disappointed with the pathetically inadequate emissions reduction target.
I doubt the sincerity of the government I helped to elect.
I would almost prefer the government to come out and say 'we do not care'. At least it would not look like such a miserable hypocrite.
So many promises, so little action.

Gray Ardern

I think Australians are so much better off than almost every other nation in the world that we have a responsibility to be leaders in the movement to stop global warming. If it is hard for us to do it will be almost impossible for countries like India to do anything. Sure it might be hard for us, but surely it is better to risk that than allow ourselves to self destruct, because we are too selfish to allow ourselves to suffer at all. Personally I care more about my grandchildrens future than my own and I think there are many parents and grandparents who feel the same. I think the government has got to be seen to be being brave and prepared to make hard decisions, if there is a voter backlash, the current opposition will be presented with the same problems and probably will eventually be forced into doing something more constructive than the current fearful half measures. But by then it will be all that much harder. Please do something bolder now so that Australia can be seen to be setting a good example

Leigh and Rodney Knock

The Government's CPRS scheme is not "adequate to avoid dangerous climate change". Not even close.

I expect the Opposition, Greens and Independents in the Senate to hold the Rudd Government to account for this failure and improve Australia's greenhouse reduction targets dramatically.

Sincerely
Sam Mclean

We believed at the last federal election that a Labor Government would take strong action on the most serious issue facing the planet; climate change.

We write to express our dismay at the Rudd Labor Government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. A fine sounding scheme that does not live up to its name. The details of the scheme are an inadequate response to the problem.

This problem needs strong urgent action regardless of pressure from powerful interests . We are talking about the long term future of our planet.

Please take the action needed.

Sincerely

Margaret and Robert Blair

To the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

Like so many others, I am extremely concerned by our government's lack of significant action to combat climate change. This is by far the most serious issue we currently face, and should therefore be our highest priority.

To focus on other issues at the expense of addressing climate change is akin to someone working 16 hour days to increase their wealth while suffering from rapidly metastasising cancer. Or like straightening the deck chairs on the Titanic. We need to focus on the big picture and focus on those things that are most important for our survival and wellbeing.

I'm sure I don't need to reiterate the need for stronger pollution reduction targets by 2020 and 2050, the need for greater investment in renewable energy and a green economy, the need for a more effective carbon pollution reduction scheme, and countless other significant actions that could have a significant positive impact on the environment. Clearly, we all know what we need to do. What's missing is the will to do it.

The Australian government is presented with a huge opportunity to play a leadership role in the world's efforts to address climate change. With significant action, Australia stands to gain even more respect and admiration on the world stage. But since we are one of the highest polluters per capita, the opposite is likely if we take the weak action currently proposed.

And so I would like to add my voice to each of the others who are standing up for the health of our planet. Please set a course that we all know is the right one - for everyone.

Thanks for your time

AJ Lester

the emission reduction targets are just too weak. Unacceptable so. Right now, the economic drivers are claiming that our economy just cant afford more committed emissions reductions. But in a few years, we are all going to regret this economic conservatism, because the rest of the world will have made leaps forward, and we will be stuck playing catch up.

The weak targets means that Australia will drop behind in green collar job development and there will be a further increase in the brain drain, with research and highly trained professionals in related areas going overseas to seek research funding and supportive technology development industries.

This is not only a blow for the planet, this is going to damage Australia's future economically and socially.

Please revise the emissions target. Its like paying your insurance premiums every year, its a sensible precaution to take.

Sincerely,
Lana Kagan

This is not even a challenge, surely we have more backbone than this. Laurel
Freeland

I voted for Kevin Rudd purely on his perceived concern for climate change. I have been bitterly disappointed to discover it was a cynical ploy to get himself elected. The labour government's response to climate change now that they are in office, has been woefully inadequate. A 5-15% target is not acceptable!

Andrew Howell

I am writing to convey my shame that Australia has committed to a paltry 5-15% cut in GHG emissions. This is not up to scratch internationally. Moreover, I voted for the current government with the hope that a serious approach to climate change would result. The current targets show just the opposite. For my children's and your children's sake, take a firmer stance.

The fossil fuel industries which have such a tight hold on government policy truly don't make up enough of Australia's work force to warrant such power- the mining industry is, proportional to services, manufacturing and retail, tiny. Taking a firmer stance with stronger targets will create millions of new jobs (see CSIRO economic modelling), something which should tickle the fancy of the government at the moment.

The power is in your hands. Use it wisely.

Eliezer Hasen

I am writing to highly encourage a review of the proposed climate change targets as I find them totally inadequate. It is obvious by the low 5-15% target will have absolutely no impact on turning around climate change. You must show strong leadership and impose harsher restrictions on industry or the planet will face an even grimmer tomorrow than the current state of natural disaster we live in (fires, floods etc). I didn't vote for your party so you could then sit on your hands on issues such as this. You must do something (and remember that industry may have money but it is the Australian public who have votes). We won't be voting you back in if you fail us and our children on this issue.

Erica Lewis

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Amanda Morris

To Whom It May Concern,

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Australia's future depends on stronger action being taken to fight climate change.

Yours sincerely,

Bronni Skinner

Dear MP,

We need strong action on climate change. The best way to do this is thru renewable energy. We hear nothing of the government comitting to building major solar plants. We need infrastructure projects to keep our economy going. Why not commit to huge solar plants to do this?

Regards,

Allan Patterson

5-15% is a huge range - I believe we need to be more specific with our target, and more realistic. 5% will do nothing for climate change, and even 15% is unlikely to have much of an effect. Increase our targets in line with recommended targets, lead the world in climate change targets, and boost our renewables industry.
Take the lead, and help our children.

Robyn Berrington

it's time to give our environment top priority.

Simple, no planet, no life.

Sincerely,

Mary Louise Valpied

I feel so strongly that the governments 5-15% target is selling us, as human beings so very very short... if climate change - which is a REAL AND IMMEDIATE danger to us all - recieved half the attention and prudent government concern that the Global Financial Crisis was getting - then i would have a chance to feel much more calm about the future of us all.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

we must set an example for our international fellow governments - we must rise to this challenge as a fearless country that will not bow t the shortterm and greedy goals of big business.

we can use a well designed carbon scheme to take advantage of new industries that deal with renewable energy.

it must be done - i implore you.

alice ansara

To whom it may concern:

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Such a weak target is outrageous to say the least. What kind of message is this sending to other nations, corporate organisations, and future generations? There are corporate organisations already making bigger cuts than this voluntarily - the Government should be ashamed.

I hope that the Australian Government finds the strength and courage to put appropriate measures in place. This is not about winning votes or getting positive publicity. This is about saving the planet we live on.

Alice Bannan

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

Enter your letter here

The current 5% (or similar) pollution reduction target is PATHETIC !

With the Titanic about to hit the iceberg, the best you in the control room can suggest is a minor tweak on the steering wheel, so long as it doesn't inconvenience anyone, while the engine room shovels the coal in as fast as ever.

You are all absolutely incompetant, blind, and incapable of leadership.

We should be rapidly creating New Jobs & Industry in Solution technologies (fast tracking - with Central Planning - Renewable Energy & other Planet protection industries). Instead you are primarily concerned with not offending the established, but unsustainable, destructive, sunset industries - while making only a token gesture at securing our long term economic & environmental security, and doing our part to save a whole planet.

Shame on you !

Turn the wheel properly BEFORE we hit the iceberg - or hand the controls over to someone who can.

Yours Disgusted Citizen

Yours sincerely,

Paul Stark

I consider the 5-15% target to be totally inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change and given the parlous state of The Antarctic Ice Shelf with the possibility of 6 metre sea level rises by the end of this Century, request that stronger action be taken.

As a solar user I resent my savings being used by a polluting industry; where is the logic in that?

Tony Bates

Dear Person,

If we care about the people coming after us, about the animals around us and given we have an ever narrowing window of opportunity to minimise the harm done by climate change. It is in most people's fibre to do the right thing.

You have an opportunity to do the right thing here, our actions as individuals, as a country make a difference. If we are quiet we are saying something, if we are slow to act we are saying something. Please help us do the right thing for the people, animal and plants coming after us.

Let us take the opportunity now to do the right thing, and set strong targets, let us lead the way to reducing the damage we are doing to the planet and people coming after us.

Let us aim for 25% reductions by 2020. We will be hit the hardest and it will be sudden, like our fires and our floods the systems of the earth do not care about our sensitivities. The systems can change catastrophically and quickly. We must act hard and fast.

The Australian tax payer should absolutely not fund the big polluters, they need to wear the difficulties and challenges of change, they have had time and haven't acted, let other companies step in if these companies can't do the job.

Let us be a country which harnesses the opportunity presented before us. Let us move in the direction to create millions of new green jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy.

Please be strong and stand up for humanity, the animal and plant kingdoms.

Sincerely,

Paul Tyrrell

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my disappointment with the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

A target of 5-15% is not at all adequate to reduce the dangerous climate change that scientific evidence shows us is on its way. Furthermore, it does not fulfil the Labor Government's election promise that they would take strong action on climate change.

Australia, per capita, is a massive producer of Greenhouse gas emissions and we need to take responsibility for this - both in terms of our impact on the rest of the world but also because of the impact climate change is likely to have on our country.

The CPRS is a badly designed scheme that has weak targets, too much compensation for private industry, not enough investment in proven green energy initiatives and not enough flexibility for increases in the targets (for example through individual emission reduction). Because the CPRS imposes a floor on emissions reduction, the action individuals take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target. This is completely unfair, as well as being utterly flawed and dangerous policy.

Sincerely,
Amy Corderoy

Australia needs a strong GHG reduction target in order to participate the the international negotiations on actions to avoid dangerous climate change. Australia's climate will be one of the most affected in the OECD countries, so strong action is critical to our future well being.

We must not give permits away within any emissions trading scheme, since this removes the market signal and makes the policy ineffective. It also provides windfall gains to polluters. We must learn from the European experience on this.

We must make reductions at home, rather than allowing purchase of certificates from developing countries. It is not equitable to expect developing countries to do all the emissions reductions.

We must ensure that the actions of individuals, businesses and communities to reduce emissions do not relieve polluting industries of their responsibilities to take action. Certificates should be retired to account for these actions.

During this period of economic downturn, it is important to remember that there are many more jobs per kWh in the renewable energy industries than in mining and generating electricity from fossil fuels. There are also many potential jobs in the energy efficiency industry. Australia has a innovative capability in the renewable energy industries, but will not be able to turn this advantage into industry growth and jobs without support. Since at this point in time, emissions reductions through renewable energy generation are not least cost, emissions trading schemes will do little to encourage them. Policies specific to renewable energy are needed, such as feed in tariffs, which have been the single most successful policy for promoting growth in the renewable energy industry worldwide.

I hope you will carefully consider these points,
Regards,
Dr Anna Bruce

I would like to make a submission to the Greens, Opposition and Independents inquiry in the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

I believe the scheme is manifestly inadequate and the targets should be much higher and more immediate. The scheme also rewards the main polluters, being coal based energy producers, through the provision of free certificates. This is ridiculous. The point of the scheme should be to mitigate the level of carbon being released into the atmosphere, not to subsidise the industry that most needs reforming.

The community understand and accept that the scheme will increase energy prices, that increased production costs of energy producers will be passed on to consumers. This is not something that should be shielded away from.

I voted for Labor at the most recent election on the basis that if I voted Green, as I would have preferred, the Liberal party may have been re-elected. I will not be making the same mistake again.

Kevin Rudd has lost credibility on climate change, by far the most significant issue in Australia and across the globe. The current fixation on the Global Financial Crisis is a distraction from the more pressing issue of a global reduction in carbon emissions. Economic regulatory reform will be seen as irrelevant when we do not have enough food or water to sustain the population.

Regards,
Ben Robertson

For international cooperation, for our children's and grandchildren's sake, for the planet, we must face the crisis firmly making sure we set and reach strong targets. No matter how powerfully the polluters present their opinions we must finally stand up for the people and the planet and make sure that industry shoulders its fair share of the cost and pain. There are multiple ideas which need to be pursued along the road to renewable energy. These are often not the paths powerful lobbies want us to follow. Let's stand up for what is best for the planet and for humanity as a whole.

*

Anne Udy

Dear Senate,

The time is now. The time is now to make a **STRONG** commitment to reducing our greenhouse pollution. This 5-15% target is ridiculous - listen to the youth of your country who will have to live with the consequences. Listen to the scientists who are finding that climate change is happening even quicker than we once thought. There's no time to point the finger at others. Instead we must look towards our own actions and take some **BIG** steps to address this issue.

We need to overhaul the current proposals by the Government. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme needs to be redesigned so that industry polluters are not compensated at the expense of the rest of the community. The actions of individuals and small businesses need to be recognised. Let us join together as a nation to reduce our impact.

Let us live up to our International responsibility. Let us be the leader in setting targets to reduce our national greenhouse pollution. Let us commit to 50% in the next decade. Let us invest in sustainable technologies and renewable energy technology. Let us embrace the environmental and economic benefits that will flow. We should arrive at the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen with our heads held high and a serious commitment to action in our pockets.

We vote you in to do the best for the citizens of this country. It is up to you to do this job well. Here in Australia, in the past few months we have seen the devastating effects of weather patterns. Let us take action to make sure this doesn't lead to global chaos. Be brave - take the steps needed to ensure the future of Australia and the global community have a chance at a more peaceful world.

We are counting on you to demand and ensure **STRONG CLIMATE ACTION**.

Yours in hopefulness,

Anjea Travers

Why has the target been set so low?

Is it correct that under the CPRScheme it will make no difference how much individual households reduce their pollution emissions?

I wonder whether anyone down there in Canberra realises just how anxious many ordinary people are, who love their country and want to try to protect its environment.

Sadly,

Ann McGrath

I would like to express my dismay at the government's weak response to climate change! With Jared Diamond and other scientists arguing that Australia is going to be the first First World country to collapse due to climate change, we cannot stand by idly and let our government's short sightedness lead to eventual social and economic collapse. We have a small window of opportunity to make change. Don't squander that opportunity with lame targets and weak programs!

Thank you,
Barbara West, PhD

Honourable Senators,

One of the reasons I voted for the Rudd government was the commitment made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This promise is being broken. The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. My solar panels will reward Origin.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. (I am yet to be convinced that these targets will be progressively raised.) In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

It is really time to make the hard decisions and fulfil the promises made prior to the election.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Dr Bill Vistarini

As I type there is a huge ice shelf about to break off of the arctic circle, if it hasn't already done so. Isn't that enough to convince the Government that something major needs to be done? Not the tiny targets this government is talking about.

I'd like there to be a tomorrow.

P Worsfold

As a young Australian, I have felt only dismay and betrayal at the Australian Government's response to climate change.

The celebration of a new Government committed to acting on averting Australia (and indeed the world) from dangerous climate change quickly turned into a bitter taste in my mouth upon the release of the CPRS white paper and subsequent NCOS regulation and draft legislation.

The current Labor Government was voted in on a mandate to act strong on climate change and not bow to industry pressure. They have betrayed not just those who voted them in, but those who are too young to even voice their opinions.

Young people are so concerned about climate change and its potential impacts that we are mobilising in every place imaginable with a mandate to act once we get into power.

If you do nothing about it, we will suffer. And we will have to bear the brunt of responding to climate change with more drastic measures. We will have to be the strong leaders who look the coal and mining lobbies in the eyes and tell them that their profits pale in comparison to the livelihoods, lifestyles and indeed lives of Australians and people around the world.

I implore you to act on climate change now. It will be the smartest political move you can do. You will secure the vote of hundreds of thousands of young people for decades to come if you take this issue seriously.

We are looking for leadership and if you fail to act, we will be forced to rise to the challenge, take the reins and shame the generations before us who turned a blind eye to one of the most pressing issues of our time.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Kent

I strongly believe that the Government's 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Australia needs to commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

This abhorrently undermines the efforts of the community to reduce their impact on the environment, and needs to be redressed.

C Hempton.

To whom it may concern

I am disappointed with the lack of focus on climate change. The 5-15% target to reduce greenhouse pollution simply isn't sufficient.

The state of the economy will be more significantly effected by the devastating effects of climate change, then increasing the greenhouse reduction targets.

Stop over compensating polluters - pay attention! You have the opportunity to make a real change and implmenting a lasting and positive legacy - please use the opportunity wisely.

Allison Stewart

I have the following issues with the Government's current policy on climate:

1. Time is not on our side - we cannot afford to take small steps. Climate change is occurring at a far greater rate than was previously thought. This is backed up by recent research findings.
2. The target of 5 - 15% is not sufficient to avoid climate change. We should be aiming at halving our national greenhouse gas emissions in the next decade.
3. Australia is setting a very poor example to the international community by setting such a low target. The low target must be improved before the UN conference on Climate change occurs in Copenhagen in December.
4. The scheme that the government has proposed for Carbon Pollution Reduction (CPRS) is too biased towards the polluters and being poorly designed could do more harm than good.
5. Establishing a bolder target backed up by a well-designed scheme will set a good example to the international community and ensure that Australia does not shirk its responsibilities. It would also help refocus industry to develop more sustainable practices and boost the renewable energy sector.
6. As the CPRS imposes a floor below which emissions cannot fall, the action taken by individuals and small businesses to reduce energy will be counter productive in that it will enable industry to increase their emissions under this cap.

Betsy Bush

The current stance of elected government on climate change is poorly thought out and clearly lacks courage, foresight and most importantly leadership. Restricting our nation to 5% reduction targets is ridiculous and ignores even their (the governments) own recommendations. What the hell are you doing with our planet? Where exactly do you think the solution will come from.

I have been investigating this issue and have found that most of the solutions are already right in front of us and can be implemented using available technology. A 10% - 20% reduction can be achieved in this country with a few swipes of the pen - simple as that....and a bit of hard work of course, but we are talking about saving the planet.

I suggest you aim for 50-65% by 2020 and really get stuck in, there is literally an army of people waiting to help you, the army is actually fighting you at the moment, wouldn't it be better to have them on board and lead this thing on a global scale, rather than be branded as recalcitrant country in regard to measures to mitigate the impact we are having on the climate and our planet.

Why are you doing what you're doing, it simply does not make sense.

Just let me know what you need when you actually make a good decision, until then I will continue to fight you along with everyone else....and the numbers are growing.

Regards
Brett Hedger

As a 20 year old, lately I often feel like my future is being destroyed to increase the comfort marginally of elderly politicians. The recent government climate change targets are just plain scary. Worse yet, the knowledge that I as an individual can do absolutely nothing to help this situation, that any savings I make will be gifted to big polluters leaves me feeling as though I have no recourse.

As one of the billions who will have to live in this planet as we inherit it, it is utterly criminal for any person, governmental or otherwise, to not do everything in their power to give us a sustainable future as a race. As someone who will have to live with the consequences of these policies for decades to come, I DEMAND that we shift towards a policy of avoiding pollution wherever it is at all possible. If science has shown anything, it's that climate change keeps tending to be worse and worse than we expected, and seems to be coming sooner and sooner. I, and many others, would much rather lose a few luxuries now, and have a comfortable life in the future, even if some of those luxuries turn out to have been unnecessary losses. You are dealing with the viability of the entire human race. Life is always worth more than money. We show that with policies that spend millions to catch mere hundreds of pedophiles. Children are worth it. We're all worth saving. We must not stop until we are CERTAIN that we have conserved enough to survive this in relative comfort. There simply is no 'good enough'.

Australian's may be famous for our 'she'll be right' attitude, but this is just too serious to trust to chance.

—

Jenna Fox

It is imperative that Australia, one of the wealthiest countries, lead by example on this issue.

Strong CO2 reduction targets must be set or the entire world will face catastrophic problems within the next century.

The science clearly sets out the size of the targets required. I urge our representatives to act now and change to targets that will offer a sustainable future.

Dr Monty Glass

I find it hard to express just how disappointed I am with the tiny target for reduction of greenhouse gases. This seems to me to be about what a Howard government would have been forced to do, and no more.

You were elected to make a real difference. It seems to me that the global economic crisis provides a first class opportunity for Australia to start to change the focus of industry away from a carbon base towards something sustainable. Former Australian of the Year Tim Flannery says we could use geothermal energy. Has that been taken into account? A prominent Australian scientist has taken his solar system to California to promote it because there is no interest in Australia. Has that been taken into account? A major solar panel manufacturer is shutting shop in Australia because of lack of interest. Has that been taken into account? I have recently signed up to make the change to grid connected solar electricity, but I have now found that my contribution (some \$13 000) plus the government contribution will be used to sell cheaper power to industry, not to cut greenhouse gas production! We have the opportunity, not to damage, but to build our industry, and make a real (not 5%) difference at the same time. Please don't do a Howard on this question. Please - take the action you promised.

Regards

Alex Morrow

Dear Inquiry,

The current target of 5-15% reductions in Australia's emissions is pathetic, especially given the projected rise in Australia's population. A target of 50% in the next ten years would be a much more effective step towards countering climate change.

The CPRS favours big business by overly compensating them for the change. It will also minimise the effects of any individual's efforts to switch to a more environmentally sustainable lifestyle.

Given that Australia has been indicated as one of the areas most significantly affected by climate change, it is very important that we make an intelligent and serious effort to reduce our emissions by 50%.

Yours Sincerely,
John Mitchell

I'm extremely concerned that the Australian government isn't moving fast or aggressively enough to stop climate change. The 5% targets are too weak to make significant impact, and I have grave concerns about the current structure of the CPRS.

We should be investing more heavily in sustainable energy research and energy reduction mechanisms, rather than continuing to support the old guard of fossil fuel burners and big corporate polluters.

This threat is far too serious to allow the corporate lobby to dominate the debate as per usual.

Michael Lancaster

5% target is not enough. We need to commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade. This is our future and the future of our children and grandchildren we are deciding on now and now is the time to put them first and NOT us!!

Regards

Beth Blok

Dear Senators,

I call on your committee to support:

1. Keeping Australia's 2020 emissions reduction targets out of the CPRS legislation until after the Copenhagen climate deal has been finalised and to set 2020 targets much higher than the current 5 -15% in line with scientific estimates of the level required to keep global temperature rises below 2C.
2. Greatly expanding the level of financial and other support to developing and implementing renewable energy technologies using financing from the CPRS.
3. Ensuring that individual, community, and all government emissions reduction efforts contribute to additional emissions abatement by further reducing the CPRS cap. Such actions should lower emissions, not lower carbon prices.
4. Legislating a ban on all new coal-fired power stations in Australia.
5. A plan to phase out existing coal-fired power plants over the next 15 years and changing the requirements for assistance to coal-fired generators under the CPRS to be conditional upon a 15-year phase-out plan.
6. Suspending all targeted subsidies, tax incentives and financial support to the fossil fuel industry.
7. Establishing third party rights under the CPRS Act, to ensure that the CPRS remains transparent and accountable.

Yours sincerely

Garth Luke

I AM CONCERNED THAT PRESENT GOVERNMENT POLICY AND PLANS MERELY PAY LIP SERVICE TO THE DEMANDS OF OUR CLIMATE CRISIS. THEY REPRESENT NO MORE THAN A TOKEN, POLITICAL GESTURE. PLEASE GET SERIOUS.

Alan Mann

To the Australian Government's climate control committee.

Your 5.15% target is inadequate for the purposes of controlling. Please seriously reconsider your present target

This exercise is dealing with LIFE and DEATH for all Australians!

Sincerely,

Barry Marshall

You've just got to make the target higher. Business may suffer a little but honestly, if you don't want the Northern hemisphere to freeze over and/or us wearing silver suits in 50 years better make those targets higher and send a clear message to industry to clean up!

Cal Orr

Mr Rudd,

For the sake of our children and subsequent generations I ask that you raise the target for reducing carbon pollution.

Given that the fossil fuel industry are the largest contributors to both our own and the world's carbon emmitters these industries should be phased out. The proposed permit system does not do enough to reach this goal and in some cases prolongs this industry at the cost of those that are transitioning towards sustainable energy production.

The apparent leaning towards protecting the coal based industries, to the benefit of both corporate and labour, will not serve the vast majority of Australians who demand more of our leaders in the fight against climate change and our energy security.

Truly clever countries such as Germany and Sweden are moving strongly towards sustainable energy production. Australia is blessed with abundant renewable energy sources that could make us energy self sufficient and a leader in renewable energy technologies.

Australia is well placed to lead the world in carbon reduction and renewable energy production technology. Our citizens will be much more resilient and our economy much stronger if we shift our resources and talent towards this goal.

Sincerely,

Bryce Martin
Wembley WA 6014

The current targets of 5 - 15% would be laughable if they weren't so dangerous and irresponsible.

There is no excuse for taking the unprecedented action that the current urgent situation requires. If the ordinary person on the street can notice the changing weather patterns, then we all know it is critical to the survival of the planet and therefore humanity itself, to be courageous and confident in facing the major polluters.

We need a strong target to change our ways - economically and environmentally.

In hope that you have the capacity to do what you can to protect the future.

Anna Adams

I EXPECTED MORE FROM THIS GOVERNMENT ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

ON LATELINE LAST NIGHT.... IT WAS STATED THAT SEA LEVELS COULD RISE BY UP TO 6M BY THE END OF THIS CENTURY. YOU GUYS WILL NOT BE AROUND AND NEITHER WILL I BUT OUR CHILDREN AND THEIR CHILDREN WILL.

STOP COMPENSATING POLLUTERS

PETER

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is becoming increasingly obvious that strong immediate action is required on climate change and CO2 emissions. All the government's language when discussing climate change seems to show they are aware of the importance and seriousness of this issue. Yet the actions they are taking do not reflect this. The targets and overall structure of their proposed scheme will according to their own report fail to halt serious climate change. The 5% cut is weak and minimal and shows no leadership internationally.

Giving away so many permits eliminates the incentive which the scheme is designed to create. And structuring it in such a way that increasing the cuts is not possible and so that the cuts individuals make will have no overall effect seems foolish in the extreme.

Please reconsider this scheme and improve it so that we have some chance of leaving a pleasantly habitable world for our children, and so that we can be proud of our efforts that we have made to address this problem.

Regards, Alex Sanson

I am a mother to two toddlers and I don't want their lives ruined by massive climate change. Our planet is precious - we have an obligation to protect it for future generations.

I am very disappointed with the government's weak carbon reduction targets. The government has a mandate for strong action on climate change - why isn't it prepared to take the hard decisions? We need to send a clear message that carbon pollution is bad for the planet, it's bad for people and it needs to be recognized as bad business practice - we need to put a real cost on the harm we are doing to the planet - how else will we change our ways?

Climate change already appears to be happening at a much faster rate than anticipated. Australia is a small nation but we have become heavily dependant on carbon polluting lifestyles and technologies - we need to do more to make tough decisions to do what we can to ensure the world moves in the right direction, and cuts carbon pollution.

Australians want action on climate change and we can do this if there is strong political leadership. What other alternative is there? We can't deny the situation we find ourselves in, or defer the hard decisions any longer.

Yours sincerely Anne Duncan

Australia must do better than the current 5%-15% reduction target. ALP was voted in to government because they promised meaningful action in this area. Unless Barak Obama gets rolled by congress, it looks like we will be trailing even the USA on carbon reduction targets - and this is simply NOT GOOD ENOUGH! I urget you to push for a huge increase in these targets, to restore the public's faith in the ALP and to minimise the damage we are doing to the planet. Urgent and drastic action is required.

Thanks, Andrew Kay

Chemicals and other pollutants have polluted the earth and are a threat to human health and all other species as well as the environment.

Your target of 5-15% reduction in emissions is not good enough and a higher target of 50% is more realistic and our weak efforts need to be improved prior to the December conference on climate change in Copenhagen

It is imperative that higher targets are implemented immediately as scientific evidence shows that climate change is happening faster than was expected

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed by our government is a bad scheme that rewards polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

A strong target with a well designed scheme will ensure that Australia does its share towards climate change. Such a scheme should refocus our economy to move towards green i.e. non-polluting chemistry and sustainable technologies in renewable energy and other sustainable growth industries.

It is not appropriate to expect small business and individuals to reduce their energy intakes to effect a reduction in emissions. Industry should bear the brunt of reductions in targets - without the impost of tax payer funded dollars on us. They have had more than a decade to invest in sustainable technologies such as renewable energy. Tax payers are not responsible for industry profitability.

b

Dorothy M Bowes

To who it may concern,

The reality of climate change is a fierce topic highly discussed and debated through the government, environmental groups and within society in general. It is a reality that is impacting on everyone's lives. Australia is not excluded from the impacts that global warming will have on the planet. However the government with the support of environmental groups, volunteers and Australia's community can work together to halve our national greenhouse gass emissons in the next 10 years.

Scientific findings have discovered that climate change is occurring at a more rapid rate then first anticipated with the Arctic summer sea ice now expected to have melted completely in the next five years. Therefore setting a stronger target greater then 5%-15% currently proposed by the government in reducing carbon emissions will help to ensure Australia actually makes a difference.

yours sincerely,

Rosanna Afford

I am very saddened that powerful resource-beased Companies such as in the coal, mining and aluminium smelting industries have hijacked the Australian Governments response to Global Warming and use the 'excuse' that our Economy could potentially suffer if we do what is required of us to help bring CO2 emissions down.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade. I detest the fact that a lower target has been set which could result in emission reductions achieved by the general public being used to allow polluters to continue to benefit financially by polluting our world environment.

Those who pollute the most should be made to contribute the most to the clean-up and this MUST begin at home before we can have the Hope of convincing other people in other country's to do likewise.

I would DEARLY like to see the Aussie Government be world leaders in developing a 'sustainable' economy based upon the smart use and development of renewable energy technology which must surely be THE WAY of our economic and literal future survival.

Making money from the natural and unrenewable resources we currently are selling off cheaply to foreign Govenrmnets is a despicable practice that has long since passed it's use-by date.

Bob Thursfield

As of yesterday the Arctic ice has been shown to be melting faster than even the scientists thought it was. A soft approach to the big polluters now will affect future generations. Bite the bullet and commit bravely to reducing carbon pollution now

Allen Ennew

Given the greater confidence in the climate hypothesis and the events in the antarctic over the last few days it seems that we are dicing with the future of our children and children's children. 5% is an appallingly low target and amounts to no target at all. I beg you don't accept this pittance passing itself off as action.

R Meredith.

Australia needs more than 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution. We need at least 50%.

It's time Australia became a leader and a shining beacon on the world stage rather than a follower that kowtows to the big business polluters.

We need to stop waiting to see what everyone else will do and instead we need to act.

The government needs to listen to the people - we want a world to hand on to our children and grandchildren. Ignoring the issue, which is effectively what soft targets are doing, will not make it go away. Inadequate targets are not helping the problem.

We must act now and decisively to stave off irreversible climate change before it is too late.

Thank you for your time.

Aileen Leddy

To the Rudd Government

Like many other Australians I am very disappointed by the Government's 'non-stand' on Climate change. If I install solar panels it will just enable industry to use more carbon. It is not about political point scoring - it is about the future of mankind - of our children and grand children.

Please change your policy!

Anna Lena Pahlman

I am surprised and disappointed with your present efforts to address climate change. My understanding of the target and the way you have structured it is that it is not going to trigger genuine reform of industry. It is a wasted opportunity. This is the platform, overshadowing all others, on which I cast my vote in November 2007.

Please take the strongest action possible to prevent further climate change - and even help to reverse the damage that has been done. We have the opportunity to be a world leader in this area, particularly as Australia is so vulnerable and we're such a high per-capita emitter. The public can see through the politics of your present strategy. Now is the time to restructure industry and the economy, so it is sustainable into the future.

sincerely,
Amanda Brotchie

Hello,

I am a citizen excited by the prospect of how Australia can be a leader in climate change policy (and associated economics).

We are a country which benefits greatly from our natural resources. We have also been touted as a nation of inventors, with the spirit of 'having a go'. Why is it not possible that we can use the necessary changes in addressing dangerous climate change to our advantage?

We have manufacturers such as Ford and Holden facing a bleak outlook, and a raft of manufacture in this country now defunct or hanging on by the skin of its teeth. Lets give them something better to build. Why can we not shift the engine of our economy from carbon producing coal, to climate-friendly ideas such as alternative energies, building materials and systems which work in harmony with nature as opposed to sealing our fate.

I understand that politics requires a delicate balance of a great many interests, but in all of our interests, we cannot compromise. 5-15% is not only a compromise, it's essentially giving up. Putting our safe future in the 'too hard' basket.

I beg you to rise above the politics of climate change, and give us all a reason to believe in the power of government. We are counting on you - not only Australians, but other nations of the world who watch us, and judge our behaviour.

Anthony Dann
Industrial Designer

I voted for the Rudd government because I felt it would have what it takes to make the hard decisions. We might as well have continued with the Howard way as there appears to be no difference.

A government must lead the way by making the difficult decisions and it will take others in the world with it. The CPRS does none of this, in fact it really gives no incentives to the main polluters to do anything other than continue in the old ways. It has taken away all incentives to both big business and to the general community.

We all understand that making changes costs money. This excuse is both short sighted and without vision. What is the old adage? You must spend money to make money! There are so many examples where Australia has lost the plot where this is concerned. Loss of our solar power technology proves the point, as does many other scientific Australian inventions that the Australian government has not got behind. With these lost opportunities, Australia has also lost jobs and will continue to do so until we can come up with a government that has 'balls'.

When a government has the people behind it and does not take advantage, then we have to think 'should this government be in power?'

Because of climate change the government should seriously be taking in hand the protection of the aquifers and banning bottled water, but I know this will fall on deaf ears and then one day when all our ground water is saline it will be too late.

Christine Butler

Public Submission - Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

Dear Sir/Ms,

I am very concerned that Australia is not doing enough in the response to Climate Change. This is a great opportunity to make very worthwhile changes and much more needs to be done as a matter of urgency.

- Greenhouse emissions must be cut by 20% (preferably more) by 2020.
- Too much emphasis is being put on Carbon Capture and sequestration from coal-fired power stations. This is unproven technology (too many eggs in the one basket).
- We are a land of abundant sunshine. Why are we not planning to build huge Photo-voltaic solar power stations?
- Renewables such as photo-voltaic, wind etc need to be the preferred option of power generation where possible.
- So many new "green" jobs can be created by taking strong action on climate change now, and driving investment into renewable energy.
- Everyone needs to do their fair share on climate change, including big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change to the tune of \$9 billion in the next three years. That's over \$1000 for every household in Australia. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.

Please take the required strong action.

Sincerely

Phil Browne

I want to ask the inquiry to have another look at the target as it is not enough to avoid climate change in the future. We have to be accountable for our children and their children. The rich countries have to lead with a higher target. Research suggests that 25% is the minimum.

Thank you and I hope you will change the ridiculous target of 5%.

Regards, Burgi Pilgrim

I voted this Government in because I believed they would act on behalf of all Australians and make real changes to save our planet. The target they have set to reduce greenhouse pollution is laughable and undermines our credibility as a nation.

I want to see our Government lead the world in Climate Change, not barely keep up. I'm ashamed to be Australian when I hear that our leaders don't have the guts to stand up and say THIS MATTERS to all Australians! It's not about money or the Global Economic Crisis - that is a reversible situation. Climate Change is not!

Alison Bonnici

Climate action is an issue of serious concern to me and one which affected my vote at the last election.

I expected the current government to be stronger on this than their opponents but have been seriously disappointed in the 5% greenhouse reduction target that has emerged. I consider this inadequate and a failure to live up to the climate leadership promised.

I am concerned at the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed. Carbon credits seem to me to risk manipulation and my impression is that the scheme proposed is badly flawed. There has been considerable reportage that private efforts to reduce energy consumption will only leave more room for industry. It is a huge shame if private efforts are to be discouraged this way.

I call on the parliament to reconsider and strengthen the proposed targets urgently.

Alan Cornell

Dear Senators, It is patently clear that 5-15% targets are far too low to have any impact. I know that other countries are crucial too, but if we are timid other will be too. If we take a stance that shows real commitment, then perhaps others will commit to effective targets at Copenhagen. Please ensure that the Government raises the target and revises the CRPS that over-compensates polluters to the detriment of our ongoing - but seriously endangered environment.

Yours faithfully

Barry and Elizabeth Osborne

We need the Australian government to increase its required targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I want my children to feel like they can have children who will actually have a future on this beautiful planet. Lets lead the world. We may be a small country, but we can have a loud voice and set an amazing example for the rest of the world.

Come on labour party, take some decisive action, that will not be popular with big industries, but will be popular with your grandchildren.

regards
Victoria Clayton

Climate change is happening much faster than we think - new scientific findings prove this. We need to commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

I want my children, (aged three and six) to have a future on this planet. We do everything we can as a family to reduce our carbon footprint. I urge the Government to do the same.

We need to focus on renewable energy, NOW.

Yours in hope,

Annalisa Giudici

To hell with the economy, and other short-term distractions and pendular fluctuations.

The stability of our planetary climate, and the ecosystems which sustain us, and all other life on Earth, are far more important!

Its time for Australia to lead the way, by committing to higher targets of Greenhouse Gas reduction.

George Paras.

show some leadership ya lily-livered, head-in-the-sand, namby pambies!

An world with 425ppm of CO2 is closer than you politicians want to believe...Last year it was 382ppm...this year 385ppm that's the facts! Hmmm...how many years away is that?

Check the science...what does a world with 425ppm of CO2 look like? (hint...virtually no ice caps, 200 or more fire risk days each year, and many degrees hotter)

Forget the politics...the numbers. The actions required of you now are not going to stop this from happening, but could stop it from being worse...you have an opportunity to set up your nation to have great resilience for this time of dramatic change

so...provide incentives, ie \$20,000 cash support to all buyers of vehicles using less than 5.0L/100km of fuel...and imagine the stimulus to the economy

establish a transport plan for renewable energy based public transport to be made available to all Australians

provide incentives to install interactive solar and wind power, ie rebate individuals and businesses generously for every kWh of power generated from renewable energy, not just in excess of consumption...oh and stop subsidising and giving an easy ride to the polluters... immediately make it too expensive to use coal

provide incentives for home grown or locally grown food, for example ... financial support for small organic food growers using the CSA (community supported agriculture) model...quickly develop it!

provide incentives for community firewood plantations for domestic and business heating, for example...utilising traditional coppicing techniques on land specially reserved for community firewood plantations

and there are so many more things you could do...

and start today...2020 and 2050 are too late for targets...we need to act sooner

alvyn williams

The Australian Government's proposed CPRS does not go far enough in addressing climate change. The 5-15% greenhouse gas emission target is too low to make any real difference to climate change.

What's worse, is the Government allowing polluters to outsource their carbon emissions - effecting no real reduction in their pollution output.

If industry chooses to buy carbon credits in the form of PNG or Indonesian rainforest (and who wouldn't if given the choice?) - there is no guarantee that in years to come these forests will not be cleared. Ownership of forest land can change hands and these (third world) governments cannot safeguard their forests against opportunistic developers.

What is worse, is that no real reduction in pollution will occur in Australia.

The coal industry lobby works WITH government to stifle real change in this country. The Liberal Government did nothing to address global warming when they were in office and the current Labor Government is just as bad.

With our embarassing reputation as having the world's biggest carbon footprint per capita, Australians need a government that will effect real change now. Instead they pander to industry with the proposed CPRS giving industry a licence to continue polluting.

As for the Government's cash bonuses - they should have invested the money into renewable energy research and infrastructure instead of encouraging everyone to go out and buy more Chinese plastic consumables that end up in landfill.

Kevin Rudd is all talk and no action.

Your etc

Ms Sally Pyvis

I believe the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate and therefore it will not avoid a dangerous climate change. I also believe that we should commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution over the next decade. As you would probably already know there is a stream of new scientific findings that show climate change is happening more quickly than previously thought. Now, the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt entirely within the next 5 years. That is so alarming!!

Furthermore, I think that Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form a crucial International Agreement and it must be improved further before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change to be held in Copenhagen. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is badly designed and will do more harm than good. I am opposed to such a scheme design that will over-compensate polluters at the expense of our community and environment. Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure that Australia will do its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also do a very important thing by helping to refocus our economy by taking advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Barbara Meaker
Brisbane Queensland

Dear Senators of Austrlai,

It is beyond doubt that the status of our country's response to climate change is, at best, still far from adequate, and at worst actually more damaging than taking no action at all.

Our week Emissions reduction target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. In its current state it is robbing us of the opportunity to be world leaders in action for climate change, and is instead setting us up as the country who, along with the USA, are vandalising the entire process.

Furthermor, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do far more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. whilst the tru leaders of climate action are making heavy polluters pay, we are foolishly proposing to actually reward them, for no other reson than to to acquire corporate election support and effectively sustain out most damaging industries.

Surely we should be compelling those industires to clean up their act FIRST and receive the benefits LATER. Instead, those 'free' Carbon trading rights should be awarded up front to new enetrprise that is taking sincere steps to change the face of our urban planning and industries for the better - and quickly.

We simply no longer have then time nor grace to pussyfoot about this issue and pander to industrial heavyweights whose only agenda is to keep their swimming pools lined with terrazzo mosaic tiles.

This bill is childish and should not be taken seriously. We need to follow the lead of coutnries like Germany and Spain, not the USA, or the failing Howard legacy, if we wish to even contemplate making headway and protecting our childrens' future.

Sincerely,
Brendan Morse
Sculptor and Environmental Thinker

Dear Sir/Madam

This is such an important time to set serious targets, let's use this window of opportunity to really make a difference. The existing scheme is not well designed for many reasons but mainly because it will end up over-compensating the corporations responsible for pollution. Of course government needs to support industry to avoid job losses however we can't afford to continue on the path we are on. Sustainable, renewable energy industry is our future. We must lead the way forward and other countries must and will follow suit.

Catherine

I would like to see the government take strong action on any and all of the issues that threaten Australia's natural resources.

In the long term we need to shift to a way of living that not only doesn't degrade the foundations of our health, wealth and well-being (our natural resources), but a way that enhances those resources by enriching it. There are many ways to do this, permaculturists are among some of the people working out how to address these issues.

Climate change is just one of the threats, the approach we take to address this needs to consider the environmental benefits firstly and the economic implications secondly. And there doesn't have to be an assumption of a trade-off between preserving reducing carbon emissions and economic sustainability. The issues need to be considered carefully and intelligently, and as our politicians, you are in the position of having to do that, but you have plenty of people around you to help.

Thanks
Caroline

As a Government, you must surely now be armed with all the information required to make a conscientious decision regarding climate change. YOU have a magnificent opportunity to do the right thing. Let your grandchildren and our grandchildren prick at your conscience. How would you have history remember you.

sincerely,
gabrielle leven

The 5-15% target is too weak to have an effect on dangerous climate change. New research has shown that climate change is occurring at a more rapid rate than was previously thought.

The stimulus handout should have gone to developing green industry- instead the govt is strengthening the commodity demand that speeds up climate change.

The CPRS is a dangerously ill designed system that will do little to reduce actual carbon emissions and actually deters individuals from reducing their carbon consumption.

Australia, instead of seizing on the chance to lead the world on solar and wind energy, is trailing due to its reliance on the economic benefits of fossil fuels and resources. We look like fools the world over.

Dont set an artificial floor for the reduction in carbon emissions- lets go to 0. Change the CPRS to ensure that reductions by individuals are not to the benefit of industry and actually add to a total reduction in emissions. Embrace solar and make our mark in the world. We have the chance to change our ecological future- don't reinforce 'business as bloody usual'.

Regards,
Ame Christiansen

To the Senate Inquiry;

My family and I are appalled at the lack of foresight for Australia's future shown by the proposed 5% reduction targets.

These targets are not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Clear evidence points to the fact that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

It means that people like myself who try to make a difference through our reduction in energy use and choice of energy type will NOT be able to make a difference; we'll simply benefit the big polluters.

Even the Victorian State Government is now advised not to bother with carbon reduction and the like, because the proposed Federal CPRS will render it impotent to make any difference to the end national output. This makes no sense whatsoever.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

My family, my young children, the planet's future, urge the Senate inquiry to reject these targets and scheme design in favour of a more effective scheme.

Ross Farnell

I voted Labour in the last election because I believed your campaigning on environmental/conservation issues. I believed Labour was serious about doing something significant to reduce the effects of climate change. Sadly, I was wrong!

Your target of a 5-15% reduction of Greenhouse gases is weak and completely inadequate!

The current design of the CPRS will do more harm than good.

Labour, you have a strong mandate from the Australia people on Climate Change. We have the technology - You have the perfect opportunity to show strong leadership on these issues to Australia and the rest of the world.

Time is running out. Stop mucking around and be courageous enough to take the actions necessary to really make a difference on Climate Change:

1. At least a 50% reduction of greenhouse gasses.
2. A CPRS that will really make a difference.

Sherryl Smith

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

The danger of not contributing more to the climate change global movement has far greater economic consequences than the short term global economic collapse.

Australians are ready for tough times. We are a tough nation. We are ready to "take it on the chin" now - so that our children and grand children can enjoy the wonders of the world that have today - that will disappear if inadequate efforts are made NOW. Everyday counts.

Best regards, Dave Mann.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

We can't mine our way out of this problem. Please act responsibly now to make carbon emission reduction a reality instead of attempting to placate the powerful mining lobby.

Geoffrey Badger

Hi, you would have to be on another planet to not see how climate change is affecting the world.

Please do something now so that our children and our children's children do not have to face the enormous challenges ahead...if in fact they have a world to share.

regards

Kay Kennedy

Hello,

I am a concerned Australian citizen who believes that the current carbon emission reduction targets set by the government of 5-15% are simply not enough.

With the recent news that a considerable antarctic ice sheet is in danger of breaking off and melting, it is clearer than ever that we need urgent action and strong targets now.

Even America, a major world polluter has stronger targets set than Australia. We should also be committing to strong renewable energy targets, stimulating growth in the green industries of the future to ensure that we and our next generations have a future on this planet, as well as the economic ability to initiate the change necessary.

Yours Sincerely,

Anaya Latter

I live in Adelaide. The Rudd government's slow/low targets virtually mean that Adelaide will be wiped off the map. The Goyder Line is on the move!

Climate Change is one symptom of our unsustainability.

Most, if not all of our human systems are unsustainable - we now globally consume in a year what the earth takes 16 months to replenish.

We desperately need an agreed-upon framework to understand, plan and manage our sustainability at all levels.

We desperately need incentives for sustainable behaviour and disincentives for unsustainable behaviour at all levels of our economy and organisation. This will probably have to be tax-based to 'hit the hip-pocket nerve' for real change.

Whilst extremely difficult politically, we need radical solutions quickly - most evidence points to worst-case scenario levels of warming.

I recommend that we make a revenue-neutral, ten-year transition in our tax system from taxes on money, earning, wealth and entrepreneur is to an energy and resources tax (ERT) which is adjusted to reflect the level on unsustainability in each good or service. So that, anyone or any entity could earn as much money as they like tax-free but when they came to spend it, unsustainable goods and services would cost much more. Very quickly signals would be sent to business to change manufacturing processes, product design, energy use, carbon use, etc. Similarly, consumers would tend to buy low-impact, low-embodied energy, locally produced, more sustainable goods and services. Obviously the ERT would include a carbon tax.

Without such radical proposals we run the risk of missing the rapidly closing window of opportunity to limit carbon emissions and make a transition to a more sustainable economy.

We may see that our Australian democracy is not the best system to force change without very strong leadership - it is too adversarial and too petty rather than being focused on real solutions. Do we need to go on a 'war footing'?

Negative environmental impacts must be limited before natural systems can no longer supply our demands. This means good science-based policy on population, consumption, energy types and use, waste/pollution, recycling city nutrients back to farms (especially P), etc.

I have been working in the field of sustainable agriculture for 30 years and all indicators for unsustainability have gotten worse, some very much worse.

I was an optimist but each month new evidence points to a worsening situation. I am of the view that we have 5 - 10 years to turn things around; a very short period.

Whilst this inquiry may be a good thing, unless it can be translated into action, we may well be doomed (James Lovelock's view is that - as happened in the early Eocene - life will retreat to the poles and most of Australia will

be desert and scrub and largely uninhabitable, apart from some highlands and Tasmania).

Good luck,
best of management, and
Regards,
Andrew Jeeves

Please, please, listen to the scientists and the weather forecasters who have studied the environment and climate change in depth. For decades they have been crying out for action, but have been ridiculed by industry and self-serving money lenders.

It is now too late to prevent climate change, but we must try to avoid the worst of its effects.

Act now to stop carbon pollution, not just reduce it. We must stop putting ANY more carbon into the air and begin helping the planet remove the excess that is already there. We must plant trees and reduce population.

Fighting climate changes is the most crucial battle of mankind's existence. If we lose this war, we lose everything, forever.

Michael

To whom it may concern

With the election of the Rudd government in 2007 (FYI - I voted for the Greens), I was quite hopeful that we'd finally see some steps toward significant carbon emissions targets from a government taking global warming seriously. Now, considering the weak targets outlined by Mr Rudd's government, I now despair for ours and future generations, realizing that our true global rulers in the form of big business, cannot be defeated.

Yours pessimistically

Darren Scott

To the commission investigating Climate Change policy.

I would like to voice my absolute disgust at the governments incredibly weak and misguided policy to reduce CO2 Emissions by a mere 5% by 2020. I voted for this government on their campaign to greatly reduce emissions of this country and what they have proposed is not even a drop in the bucket for the types of emission reductions needed to avoid impending climate change disaster.

As a parent I feel strongly about this issue and believe the government should do the following

- Reduce CO2 emissions by 50% by 2020
- Provide Greater support to Green power initiatives and reduce the dependency on CO2 intensive forms of transport

The world needs leadership on this issue and the Government must take the lead. The last 12 months have shown us the devastation of climate change with the fires, floods and drought this country has gone through.

The evidence is mounting that Climate change is happening faster than we had previously thought.

I feel the current governments current 5% target is basically like driving a car full of Australians off a cliff with our eyes wide open.

Please have some backbone and give this issue the seriousness it deserves.

Regards

Geoff Hazell

Dear Mr Rudd,

I think we have the brains and the will power to do better on our contribution to reducing emissions from Australia. I think we need a bottom line of 10% emission reductions.

Lets look at transport usage seriously in this country - don't waste time penalising fuel producers any more than at present - it is the vehicles that produce almost 5 times and greater more of emissions than the fuel producers.

LETS GET SERIOUS ABOUT TRANSPORT EMISSIONS.

Anthony Hitzke

Dear Kev and Penny,

Now that Barack has signalled his intention to fight global warming, how about doing a segue into your upper limit of 15%. You'll still be ridiculed by the Greens but you will achieve something without scaring the horses. The most important thing is to get a viable CPRS up and running.

Regards,

Rerd Bingham

Leadership required.

Stop using the economic stimulus initiatives to prop up old technologies. They promise a fearful future.

Put all money towards positive change (rail vs roads, green energy vs petrol/coal, etc). Follow Taiwan's lead. Show courage.

Use this crisis to stimulate green change.

Give us something we can really believe in and support. Delete spin.

Then I will do as everyone exhorts and have a nice day.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Claire Bossley

Dear Government,

I am very concerned at the carbon reduction targets that Australia has proposed. These are far out of line with other conscious countries in the world (e.g. the European Union) and I feel that it is Australia's place to lead the pack rather than to make the smallest possible reduction target. I would urge you to reconsider this policy.

An increasing number of scientific studies points to the fact that climate change is happening more quickly than initially predicted - however, even if the details of recent studies varies, surely it is still our moral duty to do something to clean up the earth, the air, and our attitudes to unnecessary production.

Setting a strong target within a well designed scheme would ensure that Australia does its fair share to help address climate change, and it will also start to move our economy in a direction that will take advantage of some of the opportunities of the situation that we find ourselves in.

Please reconsider and strengthen the climate policy while there is still an opportunity to do so.

Kind regards,
ALison Orr

I urge the Government to be bold and responsible in setting climate change targets that at least halve our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Alison Peipers

5% is nowhere near enough! We need it to be much higher to force big industry into making a real effort - something that will make a difference. People like me who try to reduce our own impact on the environment don't appreciate our relatively small efforts being made useless by the industry giants. Why can't Australia be a leader for once, rather than an excuse for other countries to do less than they should as well.

Regards

Janine Keirs

Dear Sir/Madam.

I am 75 years old Slovenian borne Australian living here for last 50 years being educated in my native Slovenian there for my English grammer is not the best particularly spelling as I do not know how to spell check E-mail.

I am at loss to understand our politicians not only our but as well world.

Whole world is continuously screaming about world climate change and politicians were offered solution to this topics.

I have approached our federal authority's prior BALI conference with intention to join them to BALI where I would have put on table possible solution to world most critical tema pollution to my regret there was no response from our federals.

Shorth time there after were going our state (Victorian) politicians as well to BALI I have ask them to join them on my own expense to no avail they responded two weeks after conference was over just acknowledging receiving my Fax.

If there was response world leaders would go home successfully with climate change solution.

Oh yes let me tell you in first instance I have approached Sir RICHARD BRANSON when he has started to search for climate change solution as there was no my attraction to his web advertising to many paragraphs that I deem fishy so I have ignored to negotiate with the VIRGIN organisation.

Subsequently I have taken INOVATION PATENT.

I have again try to go to POZNAN Poland last December to no avail neither from our nor Polish authority has provided me with official tag that would I have access to venue.

There after I have approached UNCC United Nations Climate Change they responded venues are not for private individuals what is going on are we really searching solution to pollution or what is the story ?.

We not only we whole world is searching for ways to employ people and financial crash here with is typical exemple where could be many jobs created.

For more information you may get in touch:
Your sincerely.

ALOJZ KASTELIC

The planet needs to halve its greenhouse gas emissions by the end of the next decade. Australia's 5-15% target is not good enough. Australia should be taking a leadership role on this issue because we are rich enough to be able to afford any costs involved, and we are one of the biggest polluters per capita in the world.

It will not all be bad news either: there will be enormous business opportunities in taking up the challenge of pollution reduction.

The CPRS also needs radical revision because it does not encourage individuals to reduce emissions, and so does not encourage the uptake and therefore economic support for new non-polluting technologies.

Let's get it right! I have two young children.

Carrie Thomas

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

I don't think this target is anywhere near the expectations of the general public. Why does our government have such low expectations of itself?

Please make a stand for the benefit of all Australians and the rest of the world.

Gabrielle Vaughan

Dear Minister,

The government has prescribed inadequate emission control targets as a measure that Australians should take to combat climate change.

The government has taken this 'timid' line as it believes that if greater targets were pursued then there would be a "voter backlash".

Over the last 20 years it should now be evident to governments that the voters are not fools and don't wish to be treated like fools.

The labour government was elected principally because it said it saw the danger in disregarding climate change. The voters now want the government to act decisively and set an example to the world even if it causes Australian voters some great discomforts and short term job losses. Employed labour will have to changeover from the fossil fuel industries to the alternative energy industries which are rapidly developing in our country. Please have the courage of your convictions even if you think such action won't have any effect on the level of world emissions. Because it will be an important moral example.

Andrew Birks

I am concerned that the government's greenhouse target of only 5 to 15% reduction by 2020 is too low to stop runaway temperature increases and the possible end of the human race and much of life on earth.

Please increase the 2020 target to enable us to achieve an 80% reduction by 2050.

Please also ensure that industry is given powerful incentives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and please also do all you can to create new jobs in the area of sustainable energy production.

Yours Sincerely

Gary Stipanov

Personal Submission To: Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

Dear Committee Members,

I strongly urge you to consider stronger emissions reduction targets than those currently proposed by both the Government & Opposition.

I realise that stronger targets will require greater adjustment both economically and socially over a shorter timeframe but believe this is a superior option than having to take more drastic action later this century.

I am of the view that compensation measures and other mechanisms adopted to ease the transition into pricing of emissions should be targetted more effectively than currently proposed. They should be encouraging less emission intensive activities and innovation across our society rather than simply rewarding current vested interests particularly in the mining & energy generation sectors of the economy as appears to be the case at present.

I also urge the committee to consider the potential for jobs and economic growth arising from the shift to a low carbon economy and greater development & use of existing renewable energy technologies. Building our capability and expertise in this areas should be a key policy objective. More support also needs to be given developing our scientific and technical skills base to deal with a wide gamut of opportunities that will arise, both domestically and internationally, in ameliorating or adapting to climate change and all its attendant impacts.

I am cognisant of the requirement for a global solution to this problem and the need to have international frameworks for emission reductions that involves all the major economies, however: leadership does not arise from waiting for others to act.

Australia can be a leader or a follower, but we cannot avoid the consequences of failure. Our scientists have told us what lies ahead if we do not begin to reduce emissions now. Only the foolish or ignorant can continue to believe that drastic action is not required.

You have been elected to address our national interests and have a responsibility to act on behalf of the Australian people of both today & tomorrow. I also believe you have a wider obligation as our political representatives to provide some positive direction to the rest of the world and build cooperation, consensus and momentum for action.

I would humbly request that you keep both domestic and global factors in mind when framing your findings.

Yours Sincerely
Andrew Whiley

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Yours Sincerely,

Nigel Westlake

To whom it concerns:

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy and sustainability.

Please act on behalf of the Australian population and be a real leader in the fight against climate change.

Thanks and regards,

Bronwyn Green

I am deeply concerned about climate change and its impact on the future of Australia and the world. There is solid scientific evidence that changes are happening much more rapidly than was previously thought. The government's 5-15% target is simply not adequate to avoid change and worse, will undermine efforts to establish effective international agreements before the Copenhagen meeting in December. We need to aim for a much more ambitious target of 30-50% over the next decade. The recent economic downturn cannot be used as excuse for not taking action. Instead, government stimulus packages should be used as investments in the future sustainability of Australia, particularly in improved public transport, wind and solar energy. Funds should be used to retrain people who work in the coal industry to build, install and maintain watertanks and solar energy systems etc. These things would be far more productive than handouts. The current carbon pollution reduction scheme is badly designed and compensates polluters at the expense of the environment and community. Worse, any actions that individuals take to reduce their own pollution will not reduce Australia's total green house gas emissions but just allow industry to produce more pollution. I was planning to install solar electricity panels on my home but am now not willing to do so as the \$15,000 I invest to reduce my own green house gas emissions will just mean that industry can produce more pollution and is therefore a waste of my money (which could be being used to help to boost the economy). This is a major disincentive for individuals to act responsibly and has been very badly thought out.

Cathy Leamey

Dear Elected Representatives

I write to urge you to consider taking a strong stand for our country ,planet and species. The Australian government must take stronger action to deal with climate change and the risks it imposes. Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to halving our national greenhouse pollution in the next decade.

Gabriele Harding

Dear Sirs,

I urge the Australian Government to take the strongest possible measures in the quickest possible time regarding the reduction of Greenhouse pollution caused in Australia. I understand the need to balance any action against the requirements of the economy and social cohesion, but I strongly believe that a target possibly as low as 5% reduction in the next decade is insufficient. As it is, change will be forced upon us long before we are prepared. Remember, "the economy is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the environment" - Gaylord Simpson, US Senator and Governor.

regards,
Bruce Bassett

We are very concerned about the governments climate change targets. The government was voted in with a very strong following supporting strong action in this area. With a 5-15% target we might as well do nothing. We as a family are trying hard to achieve our own targets but our country needs leadership in this area. Let's set a great example and become leaders in this field and be in a position where the rest of the world looks up to us for guidance. The people of Australia are ready and waiting.
Carly Martyn

We are very concerned about the governments climate change targets. The government was voted in with a very strong following supporting strong action in this area. With a 5-15% target we might as well do nothing. We as a family are trying hard to achieve our own targets but our country needs leadership in this area. Let's set a great example and become leaders in this field and be in a position where the rest of the world looks up to us for guidance. The people of Australia are ready and waiting.
Carly Martyn

Are you senators going to be hostage to the coal and business lobby? Are you not elected to LEAD the country? Are we going to be the last cab of the rank with the development of climate friendly industries? What IS the average age of you guys? You have to LEAVE THE PAST BEHIND. Get with the program, cut emissions in line with the current science and lets get on with it. You electorate is your constituency, not the coal and business lobby. ENOUGH!

kind regards

Bill Genat

Honourable Members

I want to raise the following points;

We need to act quickly, prioritising the future of our planet over our short term sensual gratification.

We need a policy that enables and encourages individuals to, reduce their energy and resource use, invest in their own or group alternative energy sources, set aside natural landscape for the benefit of future people, submit energy and resource saving ideas to those who can act on them.

I would prefer a tax that remains in the hands of the people rather than a market driven system with subsidies to major industries or polluters.

I want offsets to remain in the country rather than go overseas.

We need a government that encourages frugality and conservation of resources and places real replacement costs on our natural environment and our natural resources.

Please support and encourage the installation of Geothermal, wind, wave and solar energy, and set a world wide example for how a developed nation can support itself in a sustainable way.

With thanks and regards,
Mark Douglas

5% is not exactly leading by example, is it? It's just tokenism! Are you leaving the big, hard decisions for our kids to make? Have you had a look at Gen Y lately....they have less perspective than anyone!!

Please take responsibility now. I voted for you to stand up and make the changes we need to make. It's going to be a tough struggle, but that's better than the alternative.

Cheers,

Tonia

I write with extreme disappointment regarding the proposed 5-15% target for greenhouse emissions reduction. Scientific opinion is hardening that the crisis we wish to avert is likely to be far sooner and far worse than predicted. This is not a time for half hearted measures. Indeed, they are likely to make things worse, since they give the impression that something is being done when really it isn't. Also they make effective international action less likely.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed is even worse, as it rewards major polluters for doing little or nothing and punishes those of us who have made an effort to reduce emissions - in my case through installing solar hot water and solar power modules. This sends entirely the wrong message to all. It is a perversion of what is required.

In the longer term making a strong and effective move to alternative power sources will provide better economic outcomes than rewarding the current polluting industries.

When I see alternative technologies setting up in Australia to utilise our huge potential for alternative energy, rather than departing this country as seemingly is the current situation, then I will believe action is being taken. We are so far behind countries such as Germany, with its less than ideal quota of sunlight, that this alone is a major indictment of all governments in Australia.

We must commit to a target in the vicinity of halving emissions within ten years. Anything less sells out the future of our children and their descendants. It is that important.

Yours sincerely,

John Beasley

The latest news from Antarctica underlines the need for serious action on global warming. The CPRS is not such action -- the target is a joke and the offsets reward the polluters. I oppose the CPRS and any form of carbon trading and/or tax. What is needed is government intervention, regulation and investment in a rapid transition to renewable energy. In the immediate, the Rudd government's proposal to insulate homes should be welcomed and expanded to include double glazing, tighter building regs on new homes and businesses/offices, etc.

Cheers,

David Glanz

We have written the government several times on this matter, but are told now that a committee comprising the Greens, Independents, and Opposition are looking at the way too low 5-15% emissions reduction target.

We would like to reiterate that this target is short sighted and dangerous, most importantly for our environment, but also for our economy. The sooner we switch en masse to renewable energy sources, the more we can take advantage of the economic benefit of new industries, products, and jobs. The economic crisis is no excuse for destroying our future!!!

Dan and Lois Katz

The 5 to 15% target is ridiculously modest and a breach of the Government's election commitment to do something meaningful about global warming.

I call on you to make the hard decision and impose far more rigorous targets.

Martin Thomas

I want my children and future grandchildren to have the kind of quality of life that was afforded to me as a child. Reduction of emissions is paramount to this being able to be achieved.

Come on Australia lets all reduce together!

Alison Seymour

The proposed 5-15% reduction target is way too low, for these reasons:

- It will have a negligible overall effect.
- It does not show leadership: As Australia is a relatively small country, the greatest effect it can have is likely to be to encourage other countries to make a significant reduction. This will not be realistic while Australia sets itself such a low target.

This government need to fulfil it's election promises and be realistic about climate change. A far stronger target (eg to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50% from 1990 levels by 2020) is necessary.

Kind regards,

David.

Water is already a problem.

Electrically powered desal is not right solution for us or for the planet. Go to wind powered desalination. It can be done.

Charlie

The proposed 5-15% target is too low and will lead to far more stringent action will have to be taken in the future.

With public opinion supporting Government action on this critical issue it is essential for the Government to set a target of 50% reduction over the next decade if we are to avoid facing up to a higher unnecessary burden in the future.

Bill & Joy Ballantyne

How brilliant that the world can unite so swiftly, so passionately, so effectively around the world's financial crisis.

How brilliant it would be too to see that same focus, that same drive, passion and unity put behind saving the world from ruin.

For, after all, without her there'll be nowhere to spend our money.

Please don't wait for a global environmental crisis to destroy what we have left.

Be strong, clear and definitive on climate change and do your ancestors proud. Raise our reduction targets, refine our CPRS to make it effective for everyone, and be the noble world leaders we know you can be.

Thank you,

Kess

I am an Australian mother wanting to voice my opinion that myself and my 3 young children are not in agreement that 5% reduction is enough.. It is not enough!! This will not help and we view it as a bandaid that is only temporary.. We are a beautiful country that can lead international counterparts in the nurturing of our planet ensuring that when our children are grown they still have the beauty we have today.

Kind Regards

Veronica Clegg

You have the facts, you have public support, we need inspirational leadership to bring about change.

This is the time to show the world and the Aust Public that you are serious about climate change.

we need 50% reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions by 2020.

Please don't let us down!

matt

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

David

Hi,

I believe a 5-15% reduction in carbon emissions that the Government has set is not good enough to avoid the climate change that is already out of hand.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Regards,

Celia

Please raise the targets to avoid dangerous climate change before it's too late.

Regards, Kathy.

A 5% reduction in green house gas emissions is NOT GOOD ENOUGH. It's a JOKE!!! If this government is seriously committed to stalling the environmental degradation of our beautiful country and planet you gotta prove it to us! Get real, this problem won't be swept under the carpet.

The government should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels)!!!!!!

Australia's piss WEAK target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

In hope
Belinda Burton

I am strongly against the governments proposed target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gasses by 2020, and in favour of much stronger reductions (50%). The science clearly shows that the currently proposed targets are woefully inadequate, and would lead us down a path of inevitable, runaway climate change. Much stronger targets would at least give us a chance at avoiding future disasters, such as the loss of the Great Barrier Reef. Given our wealth of renewable resources, our targets should be higher than, or at least equal to, those of other developed countries.

Carbon reduction should be required across all sectors and there should be no compensation for highly polluting industries at the expense of householders. Resources that would be used to compensate high emission industries should instead be used for infrastructure projects in the renewable energies sector, and to provide incentives for all sectors to reduce their energy requirements.

If we allow the 5-15% target to be enacted, encouraging similar targets in other countries, widespread climate change will undoubtedly occur, and, as has been pointed out by many high profile scientists, the cost of mitigation in the future will be much higher than the cost of carbon reduction now.

Sincerely,

Dr Daryl Holland

Hello,

I encourage the government to adopt much higher targets - there will be no business interests left to protect once the environment is pushed to its final limits.

Many thanks,

Emily

I had an interesting discussion last week with someone who suggested we should have a national pipeline to deliver water between the States. I said I thought this was meant to be our river system. But without radical action on climate change we will have more extreme weather events, more fires like Victoria has just experienced and less rain to keep the water flowing. Australia will become 100% desert.

We have some of the best, most innovative scientific brains in the world - empower them and support them financially to build an industry which is world leading in renewable energy.

We CAN NOT afford to ignore this issue and now is the perfect time to take this opportunity to reshape our economy into a sustainable one in all senses of the word.

Let go of the fear of criticism from 'vested interests' we all have a vested interest in the survival of the planet.

Sincerely

Jan Wild

Dear Senate Select Inquiry,

As a deeply concerned citizen I need to add my voice to ensure that you don't lock us into a paltry 5-15% commitment of greenhouse gas emission reductions. We must, must, must commit to at least 50% from 1990 levels - even at the expense of jobs and industry. We have no alternative. I trust that you'll make the right decision for our country and our children's future.

Kuy Thurman

I am writing to request a more realistic target to reduce emissions.
Please think of our environment. The reality is climate change is happening
and without action our future generations will suffer ie our children.
I know the economic issues are huge at the moment BUT we cannot ignore this
very real threat to the whole planet.

Regards,
Jenny Esots

To Whom It May Concern:

I am an Australian citizen and would like to voice my opinion on our current Government's climate policy.

I believe that the current policy should be re-evaluated to reflect a higher green house reduction target than the current 5%. This reduction needs to be across the board and all enterprises should be measured and be accountable to working towards the reduction target. Obviously informational/practical assistance will need to be provided to help facilitate the reduction.

A 5% decrease is not adequate nor does it set a good example or standard for the rest of the world. I think further consultation with experts in the field of reducing green house omissions needs to be granted so that they can independently come up with a target percentage that would be a feasible and reasonable amount to start with. I also think that this target needs to increase after a period of time.

Kind regards
Gem Murray

Hi,

I am concerned about the low target set for combatting climate change.

The US, contrary to what most of us thought would happen with their previous government, seems much more serious about climate change, and our response is looking very weak and pedestrian as a result. This is not a good approach.

Setting much higher targets would only result in us spending a FRACTION more of GDP for a much better outcome, regardless of its overall global effectiveness. For a start, it would help bolster a greener Australian industry.

I'm actually most concerned that our ETS is only going to help the big polluters, and without a proper Greenhouse REDUCTION strategy, a simple ETS will keep the same levels of greenhouse gas production that we know are unsustainable.

Please take notice of this important step in moving to a more sustainable planet - start taking the fourth dimension (time) more into account when developing policy that affects our kids and grandkids.

Regards,
Jeff McLean

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

I am deeply concerned about the seriousness of climate change and the casualness of suggested measures to address it. My understanding of risk analysis is that risk = probability of a certain event x the severity of that event should it occur. Climate predictions can only be expressed as probabilities due to the nature and complexity of global climate processes. Many of the climate processes involve tipping points, beyond which changes become non-linear - that is, they escalate dramatically via multiple feedback loops. This means that there are (possibly) smaller probabilities of outcomes of such profoundly devastating consequences that the risk (according to the above formula) is essentially infinite. How can the governments of the world permit such dreadful risk taking with the well being of the entire planet and all its inhabitants, human and other, for now and all futures?

I call for the declaration of a global climate emergency and for commitment to and the implementation by the global community, of measures fitting to a state of emergency.

I believe that climate science confirms the need for this approach, on the basis of the above risk argument.

I believe we are already beyond the bounds of a safe climate and that we have no realistic option but to cut emissions to zero with absolute haste.

If we have the intelligence and foresight to recognise this, and then the flexibility, forbearance and imagination to make profound changes, we may have a chance of preserving a habitable planet. There can be no higher priority than this, since all else rests upon our restoring the health of our planet and all its ecosystems.

We need to use our human intelligence to realise the urgent need to let go of the comfort and familiarity of our ways and create anew, in the interests of all life.

I hope that our leaders can do just as that term suggests - lead the way by recognising and naming our situation for what it is - a state of emergency! Only once that step is made are real solutions possible.

Yours sincerely,
Kirsten Treloar

Hello

I would like a clean Australia for my children and my children's children. We have such a treasure here that we need to preserve it for future generations. We need to do it NOW not later. Please make policies to drastically reduce carbon pollution and to preserve our Murray Darling Basin

Colleen Carmody

Dear Sir or Madam,

I feel the Government's 5-10% target for pollution reduction will be ineffective. I would like to show my support for more commitment to greenhouse issues, including the support and growth of renewable energy industries.

Kind Regards,
Dee McGrath.

I want to add my voice to the clamour of concern around the adequacy of the govt's climate change targets. This is too serious to muck about with. It's not as if there are any real options on this one. Let's just get it right, because, while it might not satisfy every interest group, it will be a decision that everyone can quite literally live with.

Kim Atkins

Now is not the time to be faint hearted. We need a new paradigm, rather than a tinkering with what hasn't worked in the past.

Let's hit climate change hard.

Christine Doan

To all Politicians concerned with the debate on carbon emissions targets,

I strongly opposed a 5% reduction emissions target. This is nowhere near as high as it needs to be. We needs to set an example to all other nations that if we are serious about climate change more needs to be done than the current proposal.

I certainly hope you take this email seriously because I am serious about the future of our planet and you have the power in your hands to do what we can to save it.

Regards,

David Kearney

I am expressing my opinion on the need for a much stronger climate action response. The government's 5-15% is really a disappointing and weak response to this most important issue. I do not believe this target will have any real impact on the present climate change progression and I would like to see something in the vicinity of 50% by 2020.

Regards,

Kathy

Dear Government,

do you realise that most predictions show that Australia won't be liveable by 2050 except for that little island we call Tasmania? Do you realise that by committing to so little targets, the people that will suffer are your people?

Unless you take serious actions, the worst will happen and it will happen in the country YOU govern, in the country YOU are responsible for. It's not just about endangered animals or rare flowers anymore; it is about Australian people, human beings that have voted for you so that you give them the best possible future.

Is that really the best you can do?

Chloe Cadby

The Government's weak 5-15% greenhouse reduction target is unacceptable. It will lock us out of the deep carbon cuts we need to avoid dangerous climate change. Worst of all, Australia's weak stance will undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change.

The reduction target should increase and serious effort and funding needs to be put into researching green energy particularly clean coal.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Regards,
Corinne Payne.

I don't see any sense in worrying about losing jobs, if you are compromising the sustainability of our land, our water and our air. Re-train! Lead the world in new green technology! Don't be afraid to lead!

Wouldn't it be great if Australia led the world in new ways to do business sustainably? Other countries would be beating a path to our door to study our methods; they would be paying our consultants well to reproduce the same successes for them.

Consider it re-tooling. When you are spending money on new infrastructure, make sure it is new, green, sustainable infrastructure, not just more of what we have already.

Kitka Hiltula

To whom it concerns,

To whom in concerns? In this unique case I think we can safely say this concerns every living thing on the planet. We the people have elected you as our leaders, a very large percentage of votes were based on the Rudd Government's indication that it would tackle Climate Change effectively.

This is not a simple mistake that yo are making, you are quite simply deciding the future of life on Earth. Do what you know has to be done. Decide what world you want your children to live in, what sort of future you would like them to have, & act accordingly.

I personally beleive a 90% cut on 1990 levels is required, others say at least 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels. 5% is not enough to save ourselves.

Do what you have been elected & born to do.

Yours in trust,

Kathryn Mc Cabe

As an Australian who voted for Labor on the back of their pledges to take a leadership position on climate change, I am horribly disappointed at the 5-15% target.

I do not consider this to be adequate given the scientific arguments for stronger targets and I consider 5-15% to be breaking an election promise.

Please, trust Australians to be resilient and innovative enough to be able to respond to tougher targets and make us proud by truly taking leadership on this issue.

Colin McEown

To the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy.

Although we have vast amounts of coal for our own use and for export, continuing to use it as an energy source may defeat our stated responsibilities with regard to climate change, and the need to begin lowering Co2 emissions to a level where the climate can eventually be controlled. If we wait too long and fiddle with figures, continue protecting the coal industry by not lowering emission levels sufficiently, and buy offshore credits to pretend we are acting responsibly we are, in fact, deluding ourselves and endangering the planet. The proposed use of clean coal is merely a hopeful mirage, because even if it is a practical proposition in an estimated twenty years time, the cost will have been, and will continue to be enormous, not only due to the intervening period of excessive emissions of Co2, but the need to adapt old generators or, alternatively, construct new ones, and also the extensive infrastructure needed to provide the means of removing, transporting and storing the captured carbon. The cost to the user, the ordinary householder, would increase

exponentially. So what we are doing by not phasing out coal as an energy source is increasing rather than reducing the effects of climate change, by exporting it and its disastrous destructive potential around the world while also continuing to tolerate it here.

It is hard for a country like Australia, with its huge coal reserves and reliance upon coal power, to have to face the unpleasant fact that alternative forms of energy must eventually replace it, and the sooner the better for the future of our planet.

Sincerely,
Ken Simpson

The Australian government's current position on climate change is extremely disappointing. There is plenty of big talk, and in fact you were voted in largely because of your rhetoric in relation to climate change (I know, because I was one of them that voted for you!).

The news about our deteriorating planet is ongoing. The last reports on the ice shelf in the antarctic is a point in case.

The CPRS is an extremely bad design, and should be thrown out. We should instead impose a greenhouse taxes, so that the big polluters pay, and are therefore encouraged to take action.

Even the USA now looks better than Australia in terms of what it is trying to do.

Please, for that sake of the planet, take serious action on climate change, and stop trying to hoodwink the population into thinking you are taking it seriously.

Thankyou.

Kim Sampson

Dear Senate Select Inquiry,

I write to express my concerns that the Government's target of between 5-15% is completely inadequate if we are to avoid dangerous climate change. The IPCC came out recently and advised that we need between a 25-40% reduction globally, a move Australia supported at the time.

I believe that Australia can be a leader in the climate change debate by setting a more ambitious target and changing the nature of CPRS to create more green jobs and reduce the amount of free permits given to the big polluters.

This inquiry has a huge responsibility and should act accordingly.

Faithfully,
Clancy Moore

I think the projected targets of between 5-15% by 2020 as being completely unacceptable. We need to be much more ambitious and at least match the targets recently proposed by Obama in the US. We have just seen the largest ever hung of the Antarctic start to break up - when are we going to act?

Listen to the people.

Jenny Thompson

The current Government Target of 5 - 15% reduction on 2000 emissions is a token only. Australia is, per capita, the highest emitter in the world. The low target will be looked at scornfully by developing nations who are being urged by us to make cuts in their emissions.

The unambiguous signal we send to the international community is this: we are not serious about tackling this issue. We are beholden to the powerful and wealthy lobbyists from the mining industry. We lack the courage and the imagination to open up new employment opportunities in the renewable energy sector.

Climate change impacts are happening much more rapidly than previously thought. The results for Australia in particular will be devastating - increased droughts, floods and fires and reduction in primary production.

For our region, the prospect of 200 million climate refugees, will cause serious disturbance politically and economically.

We must take firmer action. The self-serving industrial lobbyists must be dismissed. Our economic addiction to polluting industries has to be overcome and new renewable industries encouraged to expand.

Let us set realistic targets - 40% by 2020.

Brian Phillips

Mr Rudd, Ms Wong & Mr Garrett

The Government's weak 5-15% targets for emissions affecting climate change are totally inadequate.

We need strong leadership in the areas of Solar and other energy sources to reduce carbon emissions or there will not be much of the country left to govern!

Please reconsider the options...it should be Solar NOT Coal that powers our land

We mostly live round our coastline...we do not need much of a rise in sea levels to drown us

Regards

Cheryl Renouf

Dear Senators,

I am writing to express my opposition to The CPRS as proposed. Scientists in consensus have warned we must bring our emissions down faster than is provided for by this legislation. To have a sustainable planetary ecosystem, we must stabilise CO2 at 350ppm maximum (probably needs to be lower in the long run, 300ppm). But CO2 is already approaching 390ppm! We must therefore cease all emissions urgently and subsequently embark upon urgent sequestration. The last time CO2 was current level was over a million years ago (Pliocene period) and Antarctica was ice-free in summer!

It is clear that the purpose of the CPRS is to work within the present economic and industrial system, reforming and tweaking this system to be "cleaner". I believe this is a flawed approach and shows timidity and a lack of vision, and a lack of understanding of science. I believe that if you support this system then you will be supporting a system that will fail to contain CO2 and stabilise the Earth's climate and ecology. Results will be: extinctions, permanent ecological change and suffering and death of large human populations. Scientifically, it is impossible to expect otherwise. A new economy and carbon-free industry must be built multilaterally or unilaterally if necessary.

Therefore I call on you to reject this legislation. I implore you to take courage, look to the species and the people you care for, and look boldly to a "New Deal", the full decarbonisation of Australia's and the world's economy. We have the resources, industry and ingenuity to do this. But we must all share this purpose and work towards this goal. It is no less a task than war- where everything the country has is focussed on overcoming the threat, example- 1941, the threat of invasion and conquest by Japan.

If you fail this task, you and all the leaders of the world will have failed us and all life on Earth. It will be millions of years before the planet recovers and similar biodiversity evolves.

Yours faithfully,

Gus and Claire Johnson

This is a simple message. Don't play with our children's future. If you do we will vote you out and take a chance with the alternatives. This is an issue which crosses over normal voting intentions. I have never voted Liberal in my life but if they have a better (even marginally so) Climate Change policy I will vote for them.

Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements and must be improved now.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a travesty that over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. Review it so that it does not marginalise voter's efforts in the fight against climate change. It is the single most anti-democratic scheme devised by a government in many years.

David Pledger

Dear Speaker,

the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Regards,

Dave

Dear Sir/ Madam

I am very disappointed in the proposed 5% target to reduce our carbon emissions.

This is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

It undermines efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Regards

Michael J Hopkins

Australia needs to cut the talk and put in place serious measures to reduce pollution. This means achieving actual targets which significantly reduce Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. Climate change is happening, and immediate action is required.

For effective international action and agreement to occur, a high standard ought to be set by developed nations. Australia is one of these. By no means the highest polluter of greenhouse gases, Australia should nonetheless demonstrate strong global initiative and leadership, and demonstrate the responsibility of tackling climate change with real, effective action.

Pollution is real. All individuals, businesses, and industries MUST reduce emissions. This is the only way we can avoid serious global catastrophe. The Australian government must be forceful in its implementation of reductions schemes. Arguments over economic viability, emissions trading schemes, and carbon credits bypass the core issue here: reducing pollution in real terms.

I would encourage the Senate to set in motion the means by which Australia can become a responsible global citizen by taking the required action to help decrease the impact of climate change, for which we are all accountable.

Sincerely,
Kyle Harvey

Please make a bigger effort than 5% - our children and all future generations deserve a better work.

Cathy Bricely

Dear Madam/Sir

Massive ice sheets are now breaking away (at an alarming rate!) from the Antarctic shelf.

Do we need any more proof that global warming is having serious effects on our world?

We need to do much more than we already are and we need to do it now!

Australia should lead the world, not wait for others to act first.

Mark Dowse

Australia, please increase our target beyond 15%. Please. Australia needs to help lead the rest of the world. I thought I had elected a progressive government that understands the urgency of now. This was one of the main distinction between the previous archaic government. A climate that does not spiral out of control is a climate that can be regarded as a commodity in terms of renewable resources, tourism and agriculture.

Luke Chamberlain

Soft targets just aren't good enough. How can you possibly compare economics with a planetary home?

DID YOU KNOW...

*Over the last 400 million years there have been 5 Mass Extinction Events and each time nearly all life on the planet was wiped out.

*99% of all the species that have ever lived on our planet are now extinct

I have been personally involved in a film project called CORAL SEA DREAMING with Emmy award-winning underwater cinematographer David Hannan since the early 1990's. The destruction i have personally witnessed in underwater environments have made grown men weep. Because, WHEN THE SEA GOES BAD, THE PLANET SELF DESTRUCTS!

ok, OK...you think this is another doom & gloom story. Well, F&#CK! Don't you think that our planet's destruction is just a tad of a crisis? People talk about warming of the planet and how uncomfortable things will get, but if they knew the half of it, there would be serious panic.

We are now at the start of the 6th Great Mass Extinction Event. The continuing collapse of Coral Reefs provides dramatic, shocking and indisputable evidence of this. The Ocean has been absorbing our ever increasing atmospheric emissions of Co2 like a sponge ever since industrialization began. And it is rapidly becoming too warm and too acidic for Reef building Corals to survive. Conditions are approaching those not see for more than 300 million years. This is a drastic scenario, because once the seas become acidic, so does the rain, and the rest is literally history.

So i steadfastly say NO to soft option policies. I say that we MUST as a nation bite the bullet and change NOW! We need immediate action. You don't wait until the house is fully ablaze before you make your escape. You act as soon as you smell smoke. Doing anything less is suicidal.

I urge you on behalf of all the people i know, and on behalf of the generations to come....no, i BEG you to be the tower of strength needed to be heroic and say enough is enough. It's not an economic question, but one of survival.

From the bottom of my heart,
Tania Rose

I would like to add my voice to the call for stronger emissions targets. Recent meltings of antarctic ice faster than expected, once again outline the urgency of our situation. Australia needs to commit to much stronger greenhouse reduction targets. Try 50% by 2020 (as against 1990 levels).

We have an opportunity to be world leaders when it comes to climate change. To stimulate our economy and see the necessary change as a huge opportunity rather than an inconvenience.

Australia has always prided itself on being about a 'fair go'. Well let's do our fair share and pull our weight when it comes to reducing greenhouse emissions.

The CPRS means that individual actions are not recognised as being valuable. The work of individuals in reducing the impact of climate change is invaluable, it is outrageous that those small actions are being seen as not effective due to the power held by industry.

Once again, I strongly urge you to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Yours with hope,

Millie Rooney.

I am very concerned about the weak targets proposed by the government to reduce our impact on the climate.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Regards

Jane

I believe the current targets to reduce greenhouse pollution are woefully inadequate and that we should be committing to a 50% reduction (on 1990 levels) by 2020.

The CPRS scheme as currently proposed will do more harm than good, with large polluters being overcompensated at the expense of the community and environment. I want to convert to solar energy and put excess power back in to the grid, but under the proposed scheme, that will just allow industry to increase it's emissions which defeats my purpose of trying to be part of the solution.

It's time to stand up for what is right for the planet and not try to appease big polluting business, or anyone else.

Gina Boyanton

Please please please be stronger and tougher with climate change targets.
Commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Let's make real change
Let's do it properly
Let's lead the world

Let's not be afraid.

Joanna Bolton

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. It is crucial at this time to be creating sustainable jobs.

A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

There is no time to waste - Australia, and the world, must act, and act decisively, even in these financially constrained times. Securing our country's future through ambitious targets and creating sustainable jobs is the only responsible way forward. It is the promise on which the current Federal Government was voted in, so let's get to it!

Sincerely,

Gabrielle Henry.

Australia cannot afford to miss the opportunity to lead the world on climate change, and the new and exciting opportunities this will bring.

A stronger reduction in emissions by 2020 is just the start. The emissions target needs to be 25% or greater, otherwise Australia risks losing the very things which define us, like the Great Barrier reef, and beautiful flora and fauna.

I am one of many millions of others who wants our government to show more guts on this issue, and stop caving into the short-sighted sunset industries, where Australia's future does not depend.

Be your best
Gordon Watson

I attended a lecture by a professor from the university of Melbourne last week. He said that we really need to reduce our carbon emissions by 95%! So a 15% cut isn't going to cut it at all. We've got to take a leadership role (and not go down the nuclear power track). We need to support green energy production, get people out of their cars and on to their bikes. Stop supporting carbon based industries such as coal.

Cheers

Helen Matters

Dr Senators

I heard Minister Peter Garrett expousing the virtues of the governments 5% greenhouse reduction target on lateline last night.

He avoided answering Tony's question "do you accept that the targets that the Australian Government is proposing, if accepted globally, would not achieve what you want, which is to keep c02 below 550 parts per million?". He knows that the answer is "NO" but he has lost your balls. He was elected to stand up for the environment, not become just another smarmy, smart speaking, slippery phrased politician. Here is a chance for this government and the environment minister to REDEEM THEMSELVES and set a realistic greenhouse reduction target that will achieve the CO2 goal.

Mark Green

Dear Senate,
please consider the future of our and your children when you debate the climate policy. Please set a strong target, we know this is difficult but we will be behind the government if they set a target of reducing greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. If we don't try to do this, the costs will be enormous as global warming is now proceeding much faster than previously estimated, as shown by the break up of the antarctic ice shelf. It's up to us and if it means economic downturn, we'll just have to do it anyway.
Margo Honeyman PhD

To whom it may concern,

Due to the global economic crisis, climate change debate has appeared to have fallen to the wayside. However, dire as the credit crunch may be, climate change is still happening and a stronger policy must be developed to protect Australia's future. Dramatic events in the Antarctic such as the disintegration of the Larson B ice shelf in 2002 and the recent discovery of severe thinning on the Wilkins ice shelf should be proof enough. Or look at our own backyard with the severe flooding that has occurred in Queensland or the extremely high temperatures in Victoria just this year.

The carbon pollution reduction scheme, in its present form, will not prevent extreme climate change occurring in the future, and as such is a waste of current resources. The scheme also does not target the root of the problem, with generous compensation to polluters actually decreasing the motivation of these industries to develop new, more efficient and cleaner alternatives.

Australia needs to follow Europe's lead, with many EU countries pledging at least 20-30% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. There are multiple ways Australia could cut our carbon footprint, through solar, wind, geothermal technologies. We need a policy that will not only implement these technologies but also nurture the development of these technologies for export to other countries. We need a solution and we need it now.

Sincerely,
Katharine Vearncombe

We need targets based on science. Our targets for 5%-15% by 2020 need to be scrapped and replaced with stronger ones, more likely to reduce GHG emissions by an amount required to avoid dangerous climate change.
Elliot Fishman

There appears to be overwhelming evidence that climate change is a reality and in all likelihood is significantly contributed to by human activity. While Australia as a whole is not a huge contributor to the world's greenhouse gas emissions, as individuals, our emissions are some of the worst in the world. We need help to make a significant change and the Government's proposed targets are simply insufficient.

There may be costs to the economy in the short term if we take strong, world leading steps towards our nation's emissions. There will be much higher costs if we do nothing.

Having tough emissions caps looming will not force industries out of Australia, but it will force them to invest in more environmentally friendly technologies and research which will be saleable to the rest of the world as other nations wake up to their responsibilities to the Earth and to the future.

Let's set a strong target and become a world leader in green energy, green manufacture and green living. It's an unrivalled opportunity for us to lead the world.

I hope you make the right decisions.

Matthew Springer.

Not merely for Australia's seemingly selfish sake, but for the sake of the planet and all its peoples, let's aim to reduce our greenhouse pollutions by at least 50% by 2020.

I almost certainly won't be here then, but my children and their children and their childrens' children ad infinitum (unless . . .) will be.

John Hale

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to register the strongest possible concern at the government's proposed weak 5-15% climate emissions reduction target.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

We the ordinary families and individuals are doing our very best to contribute by solar panels and reducing everyday consumption as much as we can and this load needs to be shared equally by industry.

I do hope and trust that you will take into account these disturbing facts and work to have the government's targets made much higher and policy made much stronger.

Thanks,

Kevin Morton

I am so disappointed that this is the best that you can do.
Why should big polluters just buy a licence to continue their destruction of
OUR Earth?

Spend the money sav4ed on propping them up on energy research = jobs=pride=a
beautiful world for our children's children.

Your way panders to greed (disguised as serving "the economy" - how hollow.

We're in this together. Let's be strong and set targets at 50% by 2020.

Thank you.

Jill Booth

In reviewing the Government's 5-15% climate policy, I would invite people to reflect on excerpts of an open letter to Mr Rudd and Mr Brumby published in "The Age" by Peter Marshall, National Secretary of the United Firefighters Union of Australia regarding the recent devastating bushfires in Victoria.

"The fires in Victoria have ripped through towns and suburbs, farms and forests, destroying lives and livelihoods. Never before in Australian history have we been confronted with such destruction at the hands of fire. Firefighters work in conditions that most of the public try to flee. We often put our lives on the line. We understand that our job is dangerous by its very nature. However, we are gravely concerned that current federal and state government policies seem destined to ensure a repeat of the recent tragic events."

Peter Marshall outlines research by the CSIRO, Climate Institute and the Bushfire Council concluding

"Given the Federal Government's dismal greenhouse gas emissions cut of 5 per cent, the science suggests we are well on the way to guaranteeing that somewhere in the country there will be an almost annual repeat of the recent disaster and more frequent extreme weather events.

Firefighters know that it is better to prevent an emergency than to have to rescue people from it, and we urge state and federal governments to follow scientific advice and keep firefighters and the community safe by halving the country's greenhouse gas emissions by 2020."

There are so many good reasons why we need to drastically reduce our greenhouse carbon emissions. Surely this example of human tragedy and hardship, and the possibility of it becoming an annual event, makes it of tantamount importance to the Government who "talked the talk" before being elected. We need to save our future and I implore those who have the power to take a stand and make us a great example to the rest of the world. Whilst we need all countries to reduce pollution, we do not need them to do it first.

Sincerely,
Catherine Waters

Dear Members of Parliament,

The Australian government's response to climate change is inadequate. It is widely recognised that the 5-15% target is somewhat of a token gesture and will do nothing much to slow the effects of climate change. This is also weakening international efforts.

Please set a stronger target, the people of Australia feel passionately about this issue and many will support it.

Kind regards,

Laura Firth

Please lead the world in taxing carbon.

It will result in a temporary drop in our standard of living but eventually boost Australia's employment in carbon neutral industries.

Don Ross

Hi,

I am writing to say that I am not at all supportive of the low emissions targets of 5-15%, and I believe they could and should be higher. I would like to see Australia commit to reducing our pollution by 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020.

Climate change is happening so quickly that we need to act decisively and show real leadership in addressing the challenge. I want to be proud of our position as world leaders on this fight, not ashamed at our target, which undermines efforts to form international agreement on what targets need to be met in order to make a difference to the effects of climate change. I want my kids to have a safe and healthy planet - in fact I want a safe and healthy planet, and I can see the damage that is already being done by global warming. I urge you to set a strong target, with a well-designed scheme to make sure that we do our fair share to avoid dangerous climate change and refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Yours Sincerely,

Liz Ralph

I am very happy to hear that The Greens, Opposition and Independents have established an Inquiry into the Government's climate policy. This is much needed. I would like to raise the following points:

- The Government's 5-15% target is far from adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).
- Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.
- Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.
- The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.
- Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Thank you for your time. I hope you can influence the government on behalf of all Australians to achieve a clean, green and carbon free Australia ASAP.

Regards,

Kelly Thirgood.

Get some intestinal fortitude and introduce adequate Emission targets. 5-15% is not enough. It's about time you took some responsibility for the health of the planet.

Bigger Targets are needed!!!

Do not compensate polluters, which you are doing with CPRS.

Encourage individuals and small business to reduce energy consumption as well....

Be strong. Don't roll over to the multi national polluters.

cheers

Mark Greive

I want to feel as proud as I was about Sorry Day as I am about our carbon reduction scheme.

Please strengthen the target significantly.

Kate O'Keeffe

I am writing this submission to raise my concerns as to the Australian Government's weak stance on carbon pollution reduction targets. As a concerned and informed citizen who has studied environmental issues at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and as an environmental professional, I would like the Australian Government to carefully consider the issues surrounding Climate Change when passing legislation that shapes not only Australia's future but that of our planet.

The current 5-15% emissions reduction targets planned under the government's CPRS fall far short of minimising the effects of serious climate change according to consensus of the world's leading bodies of scientists. Considering the fate and livelihoods of both our and our children's generations may be at stake here, any carbon pollution reduction target MUST be of a response adequate to the substantial threat posed by climate change. A 40% reduction of emissions from 1990 levels by 2020 is a much more adequate minimum response to deal with this threat than the inadequate 5% minimum currently on the table.

Now is a time for leadership. As politicians you have the chance to take a stance for yourself, your country, your family, and for the entire world. I implore politicians to consider climate change is a genuine issue, that requires a united response from the global community. This war requires even greater leadership, as the war against climate change does not have a single enemy to focus our attentions on, as we are all, in part & somewhat inadvertently, individually responsible for the contributions we have made. I rate climate change as an issue far above and beyond the global financial crisis, and I implore you to closely consider the facts and think beyond short term party politics and the next election, and act on this issue in the interests of our future.

I am not alone in this thinking, and this issue will be reflected in my vote at the next election.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Oppermann,

Prime Minister Rudd:

Don't make us regret voting for you.

1. Let's call this matter by its right name.
2. Don't treat the electorate like fools. A 5% reduction in emissions is practically nothing. Fifty per cent is the least we should aim for by 2020.

Geraldine Wooller

We need to do more to make the planet healthier. It can and should be done. Big business has to be made more accountable and the gov is the only one who can make them do this. So please step up and make the world a better and safer place.

Thanks

Claire Mcfee and family

To whom it may concern,

As an Australian Citizen, I wish to voice my opinion on the 5-15% target in reducing greenhouse pollution.

This target is not adequate considering the rate of the planets climate change. It should be far closer to 50% by 2020 to have any impact whatsoever!

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

A "band aid" is not going to stop the flow of blood ..the planet is in stress!!!

Regards

Cassy Dark

Dear Senators,

As a household, my family have invested our savings in a number of technologies to reduce our energy consumption, including grid connect solar panels on our roof. I expect my government to at least match the ordinary Australian family in their efforts to reduce carbon emissions.

The scientific evidence is there. We must act NOW. I want the Australian Government - on behalf of its People - to set a target of reducing greenhouse pollution by 50% over the next 10 years. The proposed target of 5-15% reduction is totally "head-in-the-sand stuff". This is serious. The survival of our planet for succeeding generations of all forms of life depends on real, action now.

Let's not wait for the rest of the world to act; Let's lead the way!

With respect and hope,

Catherine Corbitt.

The Government's current greenhouse gas target is far too low to be effective. Changes will hurt, but without a liveable environment there is no point in worrying about jobs or economics.

Set a decent target, in the order of 45%-50% down on 1990 levels, and make sure that all actions by all governments are aligned to benefit the environment.

Householders must be able to see their efforts bearing fruit and not just used as offset for big polluters to get away with 'steady as she goes'

Get this right and we can be world leaders, stuff it up and we will be condemned in history, and maybe fried in life.

Graham Bradshaw

It's amazing what we can do when we have the right incentive. I'd like to add my voice to the many who are urging our government to take the lead and help everyday Australians to do the right thing.

I truly believe that climate change is the most important issue facing the world and we're coming dangerously close to the point of no return.

Even though the short term pain of drastic action might be a bitter political pill to swallow, we must take bold steps if we're going to survive climate change.

I'd be willing to make very big sacrifices if I knew the whole country was there with me. And I know that others would too. You represent us so please represent our FUTURE wisely.

Matt Callander

Dear Leaders

Not sure if the news of the Wilkins ice shelf has trickled down to Canberra yet but the feeling on the street is one of panic.

Please, please, please start taking definitive action by improving on Australia's miserable climate change target and by revising the CPRS so that it rewards positive action amongst the community.

Let's be leaders on this issue. It is, after all, a matter of life and death.

Cecilia Ritchie

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Philippe Doyle Gray

While world attention focuses on the GFC it seems most world leaders are missing the point - if we do not act immediately and decisively to contain the damage done by human-accelerated global warming, within a decade or so we won't be in a position to worry about the economy at all; we will be overwhelmed by trying to deal with escalating natural disasters.

I urge you to heed the wisdom and urgent climate change actions advocated over many decades now by scientists like Dr David Suzuki and Dr Helen Caldecott, to name just a couple.

Lip service is a disservice to all Australians now and down the generations to come (if they should be so fortunate to have a climate in which they can survive).

Please take to heart the scientific and economic advice of eminent experts on this issue, and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50% within the next 10 years. We are a small nation very visible on the world scene. Others will be influenced by what we do and don't do, whether it be courageous or a weak compromise. So please make our actions count, for the earth and for humankind.

For our sakes, for the sakes of all life on this beautiful planet, and for the sakes of generations yet unborn, take strong action to halt global warming now. Be very sure your reputations rest on this, as does my vote at the next election.

Please!

Desney King

To whom it may concern:

I strongly believe the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Regards
Fiona

I implore that the government use its financial commitments developed to tackle the economic crisis to address the climate change challenge. Set more challenging CO2 reduction targets (more than 5-15), invest in renewal energy (not fossil fuels), invest in public transport (not roads or the car industry, etc.

Give our children a chance to live in a world as good as the world we know.

Ian Harris

The Senate must show some leadership in the absence of any in the lower house. Greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced much more than the Rudd govt is proposing. Any blind person can see the the planet is heating up and we must prepare as best we can for a grim future for our descendants by putting up with some hardship now. The health of the economy is just one aspect to be considered.

Clare Gallagher

There will be no economy to save if the planet can no longer support human civilization. The greenhouse gas emissions targets set by the Federal Government are too low - the ice caps are melting much faster than anticipated. As a first world country Australia must show leadership and a willingness to make unpopular decisions that will lead to the greater good for the whole world. It should not be left to individuals and small business to make sacrifices (though willingly) while industry is allowed to increase their emissions.

yours sincerely

Lin Cooper

Dear Mr. Rudd,

I am embarrassed by and so disappointed in your government's initial target of only 5% reduction, particularly with the exemptions offered to large emission export businesses. If it weren't so serious it would be funny.

When your government came to power we were all delighted with your willingness to sign the Kyoto protocol but we never expected your action to stop there.

Please do something genuinely positive to help reduce climate change, such as setting an initial target of at least 20% by 2012 with no exemptions for big business and then progressing to the targets that might really have an effect like 40% in 2020, 60% in 2030 and so 100% by 2050.

I am very concerned by the push to dig coal out of the ground as fast as possible. We will be needing coal for a very long time yet so we should not be trying to mine it as though it will run out of usefulness soon. Also, instead of cash handouts to individuals, why not put the money towards some solar-thermal power stations. They will create employment, at all levels of intellectual ability, as well as providing extra electricity and at relatively little environmental cost.

Please stop being so weak, start listening to people who care about the planet's future welfare rather than big business which simply wants profit at all costs.

Yours sincerely,

Jane McLean

Climate Change should no longer be a topic of debate, it is time for strong leadership, especially against the powerful influence of vested interest business groups.

Look around, the planet is on fire.

Please act.

Dr Mark Norman

I acknowledge the targets may be set to reflect the current political landscape and willingness of established industry players to move ahead. Although I would have hoped for more political courage to bring forward more ambitious targets I appreciate that this is a first step in the right direction.

What however is missing currently is a feasible roadmap how to achieve these targets. 20% renewables by 2020 sounds good, but how are we going to get there. We need some type of predictable, reliable and simple scheme as for example given by feed in tariff regulations.

Keep it simple
Make it reliable and predictable
Show commitment

Thank you

Christian

To whom it may concern (everyone!!!)

I would like to express my outrage over the Rudd governments target of between 5-15% of emissions reduction by 2020.

I believe we could obliterate that target with some investment in the right areas, I live in Perth (the 3rd windiest city in the world and probably the sunniest) and I would really love a job in the alternative energy industry. It seems to me if we were serious at all about trying to make a difference then Perth (also more millionaires per capita than any other city) would be the first to invest some of the states earnings into a sustainable future.

It really disheartens me to know we are to greedy, scared or stupid to make a change on such an important issue.

So to summarise.

1. The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 are far too weak. If the rest of the world was to adopt similar targets Australia would face a future of more frequent and extreme weather events. If we fail to tackle the climate crisis now, we will suffer more deadly bushfires, costly floods and cyclones.
2. Everyone needs to do their fair share on climate change, including big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change to the tune of \$9 billion in the next three years. That's over \$1000 for every household in Australia. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.
3. Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy, not destroy jobs as the big polluters claim.

I was ashamed to be Australian and ashamed of Kevin the day these targets were announced.

Chris Martin

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Please take strong action on this issue. The community expects the government to lead and honour the pre election rhetoric and implement the recommendations of the Garnaut report, you have an opportunity to hold them to account on delivering.

Judi Johns

Prime Minister Rudd,

Please represent the wishes of the Australian people who voted your party into office rather than the climate sceptics and the powerful power industries .
When you leave office you need to be able to say you made a a large difference to Australia's rate of climate change.

Remember the Green vote increases at every election and eventually members of other parties will be joining the Greens.

Graeme Walters

To whom it concerns,

I would like to add my voice to the many that think a 5% reduction in greenhouse gases is a joke. This is a token gesture.

Please get serious, this is the most serious of matters..

Sincerely,
Mark Ribbans

There are many individuals personally making changes to leave the world a better place for our children. Unfortunately these efforts are in vein if the Australian government is not willing to put in the strong policy required to reverse the effects of climate change. To make a difference in life, you either need inspiration or desperation. Unfortunately this government is showing us neither:

- The 5-15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. I accept they are in a difficult position not having control of the senate and one side asking for it lower. This is a shame.

- Investing in proven renewable energies is the smartest solution here. Companies such as Ausra (who have had to go overseas for work) have proven solutions that can generate base electricity. It is stupidity not to use our superior natural resources (the sun in Australia) to innovate out of this.

They say what we do in life echoes through eternity, please make the right decision.

Yours Sincerely,

John Ryan
Ivanhoe

Our climate change target needs to be higher than 5%. We need to do our fair share in contributing to the worlds effort in tackling climate change.

Australia is a beautiful country with a wonderful climate and I want it to stay that way for my childrens future.

Inga

Mr Rudd - your government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is a dud - it needs CPR before it comes into effect.

Its targets are too low - 25% is needed and achievable by 2020.

It allows no credit for any CO2 reductions made our own initiative - these would simply allow the big polluters to pollute more.

Fix it, Mr Rudd, Ms Wong and Mr Garrett, and fix it fast. That's why we put you in government. Remember - we can always take you out again.

Dick Clarke, Sydney

Scientific evidence is telling us that climate change is a bigger crisis than we have previously thought yet the Governments target of 5-15% reduction by 2020 is nowhere near the change we need to see to make a difference. In addition to poor target the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is also floored. It over compensates polluters and gives large polluters no incentives for carbon reduction. Because it imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall it undermines the efforts made by small business and individuals by allowing big business to increase their emissions according to others savings. It is important for the future, not just of Australia but of the whole world, to increase the targets. What kind of planet do we want to leave our childrens children.

Heidi Bone

PLEASE, take more action to avoid dangerous climate change. Along with many others, I voted for Federal Labor because of the intention to tackle climate change. So far, the response has been extremely disappointing.

Climate change is happening even more quickly than the worst-case scenarios described by scientists some time ago. We need a much stronger Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme -- the current one is woefully inadequate and actually harmful rather than helpful.

Sincere thanks
David Hornsby
(on behalf of my grandchildren, who are hoping
to inherit a clean, healthy planet).

Dear inquiry members,

Every day on the news and in scientific papers we see more and more evidence that climate change is happening - and much faster than we anticipated. It's time we took our collective heads out of the sand and started to make the tough decisions NOW that will give us some hope of a livable climate for future generations.

The government's current CPRS proposal does more to undermine meaningful emission reductions than support them. It makes a mockery of anything that individuals try to do and rewards excessive polluters for the very thing the scheme is supposed to prevent! It is just mad to have such a weak 5 - 15% target. It's too little, and practically too late.

We need urgent action to refocus our industries and economies on more climate friendly ways to build a new and thriving economy -something we will not have going forward if tough action on emissions is not made now. We will ALL suffer if climate change continues unchecked with increasing drains on national resources to combat increased sea levels, climate change refugees, dramatic weather events and the impact on our ability as a nation to grow enough food to sustain our population.

We need serious targets - at least a 50% reduction on 1990 by 2020 - and we need them now. For once let's be a world leader and be a model for other countries to follow.

Thank you,
Gabrielle Prior