

Let's face it, as a nation we are regarded by much of the global community as having no real interest in contributing substantive contribution to quell the danger of climate change. I'm an immigrant and proud to be an Aussie, but, when it comes to the climate change policy of this government, I have to hang my head IN SHAME! --As it is, we are setting a very bad example without any leadership whatsoever.

I want to see targets of at least 20% by 2020 and 50% by 2050. THIS IS DOABLE! We must act in accordance of our true greatness. We must stand as a proud example of true caring for our Mither Earth- an example will inspire which our neighbors and the global community!

I EXPECT US TO TAKE LEADERSHIP. WE MUST ACT, NOW!!!! ~MAS ROGERS, VIC.

Dear Senators,

I implore you to make a historic decision which will impact the future of all generations of people and other species in Australia, the World, the Planet.

Reject the RPR scheme,

and help to set the subission reduction targets much higher: 50% by 2020. The most effective scheme will be to switch to 100% renewable energy by 2020. It will create employment, boost the economy. The greatest polluters and their lobby groups who got us into this mess should not be rewarded by being exempt from any transitional measures.

Please use Australia's privileged position in the world for setting a good example. We could become the model continent for renewable energy. We've got it all, why waste it?

Angelika Treichler

We voted the Rudd government into power primarily because they seemed committed to really doing something to make Australia a player in reducing greenhouse gases. We trusted you, now it seems you were all talk and are not going to do the right thing. There are no excuses, stop the political jargon that tries to brush things under tmat. Do the right thing for the future of the only planet we have to live on.

Yours in hope

Vicki Hare

Dear government,

You are leaders!!! Act like it, a 5-15% target is not enough to avoid dangerous climate change.

I want serious targets that make us change our behaviour, change is good, and needs to be embraced by corporations, government and individuals.

Warm regards,
Kari

Dear Kevin,

I am horrified by the ridiculous figure your government has arrived at as a target for greenhouse pollution reduction. It should be obvious to you by now that this is nowhere near adequate to halt, let alone reverse, the trend of climate change that we are facing.

The CPRS scheme is hugely flawed and does not encourage anyone to make changes to their lifestyle, as any reduction will immediately allow the fossil fuel industry more opportunity for 'business as usual'. My disappointment of opting for 100% green energy cannot be expressed strongly enough knowing that my reduction in pollution makes no difference at all to the grand total.

Stop the subsidies to the polluters, make people pay real prices for energy...this will discourage waste and reduce usage, and start supporting the renewable energy sector.

We need a leader who is brave enough to make this giant leap.

Is it you, Kevin?

Regards,

Janet Grogan

To whom it may concern,

Please consider the voice of Austalians (at home and abroad) while reviewing the inadequate carbon reduction targets currently proposed. I do not believe that such targets will achieve meaningful results in preserving the planet's resources for future generations.

After ratifying Kyoto it is hypocritical in the extreme for the current government to stray so far from the spirit of the agreement. The government's actions now will influence my vote in future elections and I believe will for many Australians.

Your sincerely,

Gemma Drummond

Get real guys!

Doesn't anyone seem to realise that if we don't put sustainably renewable energy and transport at the top of the list of things that need dealing with immediately, in due course we won't be able to live in this country in any way similar to how we do now.

Please make alternative transport and energy a priority now.

Yours sincerely,
Christina Khumari

I established the first business aimed at carbon trading in Australia and closed it down as the Howard govt's refusal to sign Kyoto meant possible trading was unsafe to investors and not fungible or transparent for traders. As a businessman with a large rural investment company I have carefully considered the impact of climate change and the current economic climate. The CPRS is not adequate or sufficient.

I have grandchildren who should be entitled to the planetary biodiversity that presently exists. Unless much higher targets are set this will not happen. Please speak up for our grandchildren and work on much higher targets than those which suit the coal industry.

Of course it will cost all of us money, it must do so if we are to change behaviours.

Max Bourke AM

The science says we need to go to zero net emissions ASAP, not to avoid dangerous climate change (we already have that - thousand and thousands of human lives lost worldwide and species driven to extinction and many many more driven towards the edge) and not so we can be certain of avoiding climate tipping points (we might already be committed to these, we just don't know) but to give ourselves the best chance of avoiding the worst of the worst of climate change.

The Beyond Zero Emissions group in Melbourne is the only group I know that is taking this problem by the throat and trying to map out a plan for Australia that will reduce our emissions to zero by 2020. They are throwing themselves towards this ambitious goal in the knowledge that it is in striving for what we really need to achieve we at least have some sort of chance of achieving it. It is fairly pointless to aim for a reduction target that we already know will not save our arses even if we reach it. This group gets no government funding but they are doing the job our government should be doing - trying to preserve a semblance of a natural resource base and an economy that might provide for a semblance of the level of amenities in Australian society that we would like our children to remain accustomed to.

Other countries, Spain, USA have solar thermal plants set up and running and generating electricity through the night. Why are we piss farting around with this?

We have the production capacity in wind turbines right now in Australia to be rolling them out while we develop a solar thermal capability. Why aren't we doing this?

The draft CPRS is so far off the mark I can hardly bring myself to address it directly. It will be hugely damaging in its current form. Almost as scary, there is nearly nothing else happening. An effective CPRS is just a tiny part of what we need to be doing.

I live in the Federal seat of Corangamite. My local member has just announced yet more road funding to duplicate some more of the Princes Hwy. It is as if the Federal (and State and Local for that matter) are living in a dream world. For them Climate change is merely inconvenient, Peak Oil does not exist and pigs might fly.

Regards, Janet.

Australia could be leading the World on Renewable Energy Production. Australia, being an island-continent, could incorporate the broad range of Alternative/Renewable Energy Options (including Wind, Sun, Tidal & Hydro), and aiming for Zero Emissions. If we, as a Society, as a Race, continue to decimate the very source of our existence/survival then we are ALL doomed. Scientists tell us that Drastic Change is needed to have at least a chance to prevent irreversible Catastrophe. In this time of economic recession with unemployment increasing, Why not pour our energies and monies into building Renewable Energy Stations and, in turn, create jobs in a broad range of industries and re-train/educate those employed in out-moded industries. It is Time for Radical Change, let's Rise to the Challenge. Sincerely Sandra

Dear Members of parliament all

The Government's efforts on climate change are pathetically weak and disappointing. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. The opposition (other than the Greens) provides an even worse option - delay.

The Rudd Government was elected on a platform that included action on climate change. As a Labor voter I feel seriously let down. People are keen to take action but it needs government initiative.

The global financial crisis is a minor problem compared with global warming. Don't weaken. Strengthen. Investment in sustainable infrastructure is sound investment, especially in these fraught financial times. Stop giving \$900 handouts and use the money strategically.

Yours sincerely

Belinda Nemec

I just wanted to express my dissatisfaction at the government's weak stance on climate change. This issue was one of the key voting points on why I supported Labour in the 07 elections.

If this summer's heatwave taught us nothing, it is that not taking strong and decisive action on climate change costs us more (and more and more in the future), than the cost of acting now and showing leadership in this critical issue.

kris washusen.

Australia should not be afraid to take a tough stance on Green House Emissions. We have the opportunity to become a world leader in this field if we maintain the courage to take resolute action.

As a worker I am concerned about the short term pain which may be experienced in our Economy. But as a citizen of the world and a grand father I am more concerned about the long run impact of a failure to take strong action now.

Regards

John Pretty

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to express my disappointment at the government's current climate policy. The 5-15% target in reducing greenhouse gas emissions is woefully inadequate. Reputable and replicable scientific models are estimating that we need to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by at least 50% in 2020. This research has adopted middle-ground estimations from models. What is particularly concerning is recent evidence that climate change is accelerating at a pace far greater than predicted by even the most radical models.

Australia is a wealthy country in a position to display leadership on this issue. I give no credence to the claim that we are a small polluter therefore our actions amount to nothing in the face of China. Per capita, we have one of the largest greenhouse footprints and set a very poor example for the developing world. The weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements, and must be improved before the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

On a personal level, i want my young children (currently 1 and 3) to be able to have children in an unfettered and environmentally sustainable world.

Yours sincerely

Dr Kim Felmingham

Please stop concentrating on the other countries. We as Australians have one of the largest carbon footprints.
We should lead by example. We are so wasteful.
We need to have efficient ways to REDUCE.
Resi

I would like to state my extreme disappointment on the government' s apparent complete lack of insight on the threat of climate change to our planet. The policies to date are completely inadequate and they are compromises which we cannot afford. The 5-15% target reduction is not adequate at all. We should be committing to at least 50% reduction on our greenhouse pollution by 2020. I dont understand why with all the evidence available, our government continues to ignore the facts and allow our country to continue to contribute to this fatal problem.

People in our country have become accustomed to living in a great deal of luxury. WE could all easily manage on a lot less with a lot less waste, as our former generations managed to do. Happiness is not determined by wealth, that is a known fact.

Please do not be afraid to make people in our country uncomfortable in order to be aware of how little time we have left if things continue in this way. You have a duty to us all.

Thankyou

YOurs sincerely

Dr Katelnd Griffin

Please see past the usual politics and point scoring. This is human life on the planet that we are talking about.

Australia should be setting much stronger targets and developing schemes that encourage all members of the community to contribute rather than discouraging individual efforts.

Make industries reduce their carbon pollution at the source now. We have to change the way we live immediately. Stop making it easy for industry. Yes I know about the economy but without an environment there is no economy at all. Better to deal with the financial and industrial difficulties than lose the climate change battle.

Focus the economy on climate change initiatives and create new opportunities for those who lose out over old technology industry shut downs. There is no room of compensation that encourages the continuing carbon polluters and destruction of our environment. Please be creative and focus on the real issues. We want a strong, determined and effective climate change action.

Joan Pearce

Wakey! Wakey!

There's NOTHING more important than the need to urgently slow and then reverse the damage we're doing to our climate.

You and our state governments are already guilty of committing 'rivercide' by putting jobs before the environment. It seems to me to be totally myopic that you seek to preserve jobs while you destroy the very thing - the river - that has sustained them.

Now, once again, you're being unduly influenced by vested interests to delay and reduce the necessary measures to control carbon emissions. Employers and employees, in pursuit of a short-term income, are very much like politicians with their focus on the next one or two elections.

It's particularly depressing for a great-grandparent like me who knows the two generations of my descendants that will have to try and live with the devastation that will surely follow if you - our leaders - fail to take the necessary, urgent corrective action.

Please stop searching around for plausible reasons for minimising or deferring the required response. There is no possible excuse for not taking strong action on our behalf.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint.

Harry Joyce, Goolwa

To whom it may concern in the Senate

The Government's weak 5% 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.

I believe that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

I also believe that 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.

Yours Sincerely
Paul Watson

I believe that the Government's Emission Trading Scheme proposes far weaker targets

- 1) than the Government promised (prior to the election) and;
- 2) far lower than the earth needs.

The Government needs to fix this problem before it enacts inadequate targets.

The largest polluters ought be restrained, instead of being rewarded for their excessive emissions. The fact that they are in a competitive market is no reason for allowing them to continue to grossly pollute the atmosphere.

Denis Wilson

I'll be frank - these are the steps that I have taken to reduce Australia's Greenhouse Pollution:

1. Downsized my 4WD to an unleaded small hatchback car and I car share.
2. Added water solar heating panels to my house.
3. Added x water tanks to my house, holding 25,000 litres of rainwater.
4. Swapped over to energy saving lightbulbs
5. Have a policy of 2 lights on maximum at a time.
6. Installed a biocycle for my wastewater, and
7. I use NO chemicals whatsoever in house, bathroom or garden.

I am saving up for solar electricity panels. I do all of this, NOT because it's 'trendy' but because I want to save my country, I want to save our planet.

WHAT IS MY WORKPLACE DOING? They've done NOTHING until the last month. They are a large employer (500 plus). ONLY NOW are they looking into GRADUALLY bringing in environmentally friendly ideas.

NOT GOOD ENOUGH. Whilst I congratulate them on making a small effort, all businesses and INDUSTRIES should be informed, encouraged, audited and legally FORCED to make cuts and save our planet.

My most frightening thought is that at school I learnt that the Ice Age took thousands of years to happen. NOW it will happen in my lifetime. SCARY.

Please, commit to 50%. Make industries COMMIT to 50%. Individuals are doing their bit. Large groups of individuals can do more. Thank you.

Dee Handyside

Members of Parliament,

I voted for the Greens aware that if we as a country, Australia, do not comply with what the UN International agreement requires before December we will have alot to answer for.

Do we want that over our heads? What will be tell our children and grand children?

SORRY WE DIDN'T KNOW!!!!!!!

Thanks

Emmie Sloof

I write to add my voice to that of many Australians I talk with. We are concerned about the effects of climate change on the world. In Australia we are experiencing extremes of drought, heat, floods not known before. I have personally experienced the trauma of Black Saturday at Healesville in Victoria.

The response proposed by our present government is inadequate to cope with the challenges of the future. It sets a poor example to the rest of the world. It does not impose sufficient restrictions on our big polluters. It is a weak effort and falls far short of what I expected when I helped vote the Rudd government into office at the last election.

I know it will increase our living costs and as an age pensioner that is not attractive to me. However it is our responsibility to remedy the damage we have done in the past and meet the costs involved in doing this. If we do not accept this challenge then history will condemn our generation for its negligence and we will have failed our children and grandchildren.

Bruce Osborn

Climate change was a very important reason that I and many other Australians voted for a change of Government at the last election.

We believed that the Labor party would take the decisive and strong action that was needed, and enough of us thought it important enough to give a large mandate.

The 5-15% target is a disappointment, wasting that electoral advantage, and endangering our future.

The latest scientific evidence is that this is even more urgent as the pace of climate change is accelerating. We can not continue to pretend it isn't happening and put off action for short term gain.

A low target will encourage minimal effort, and send the wrong message at a critical time.

I want my government to be involved in and promote the research and development of alternative energy sources, not become a player in Carbon schemes that seem to be little more than avoidance and brokerage manipulation.

Surely the current financial crisis shows that the free market management of public institutions doesn't produce results that work in public interest.

I believe the concentration on alternative energy industries could be an economic gain for Australia, not just a cost, with Government leadership.

Thank you for considering my submission.

yours faithfully

Bernadette Magee

Dear Senate Committee,

My concerns are several.

Targets are too low. A reduction of 5-15% will not do the job.

I am persuaded by Guy Pearse's "Quarry Vision" that this government, like the last, has been spooked by the coal industry. The extent to which Australia 'rides on coal's back' is not as big as it is made out to be. Even before reading Pearse, it has always seemed to me that 'clean coal' is pie in the sky. I just cannot envisage carbon sequestration as routinely employed in the manufacture of electricity from coal in the next ten, thirty or even fifty years.

The carbon trading scheme proposed fails to provide incentives for the creation and utilisation of green technologies here in Australia. A carbon trading scheme is fine, but not this one.

- Big polluters can buy credits by investing in third world forests. That is likely to be so cheap that that is all they will do.

- (I understand) individuals' actions in reducing their carbon footprint will just leave more room under the cap for the cap-and-trade scheme. Their actions will be futile. I was about to switch to 'true green' electricity, but there is no point if that just lets Loy Yang send more brown-coal electricity to Alcoa.

Thank you for reading my submission,

Frances Hanks

We need stronger target for carbon pollution reduction. There are many cost-effective strategies, e.g. solar air as well as water heating, co-generation (combined heat and power) as well as tri-generation (heat, power and cooling), requiring time of use electricity meters, wind farms and smart electricity grids.

Most of these strategies would create jobs, save energy and improve our environment, and so provide real benefits as well as reducing carbon pollution.

Another win-win strategy is to promote bicycle travel, which will to improve health and the environment as well as reducing carbon emissions. If people are encouraged to cycle to train stations instead of walking, the cost of public transport infrastructure is substantially reduced.

Sadly, many of these benefits won't be realised under the proposed CPRS. The scheme is too complicated and will be costly to administer compared to a simple carbon tax with the proceeds used to fund reductions in emissions, including the many ideas listed above. A carbon tax might be even more popular if half the proceeds are used to reduce other taxes and the remaining half used to fund a large range of measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

For the sake of our health and environment, as well as the planet, please make the necessary reforms to ensure Australia's CPRS reduces carbon pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

Dr Dorothy L Robinson,
Armidale, NSW

To whom it may concern,

Unfortunately the governments minimum 5% greenhouse gas reduction targets are way below what is needed to curb climate change. We are on a collision course with disaster and the only way to avoid it is to substantially reduce our CO2 and methane output. Please reconsider the target as it needs to be in the order of 40% to 50% reduction on 1990 levels.

Regards
David Anderton

Dear Sir or Madam

The lively debate around the CPRS has engaged all aspects of Australian community, which is exactly what is required to enable meaningful, rapid de-carbonisation of our economy. The sad thing is that the engagement is in a negative rather than positive manner, clearly a reflection of the inadequacy of the CPRS as it stands

Specific issues that require resolution prior to the CPRS being enacted are:

- Targets are inadequate and do not reflect current scientific data nor international stated ambition
- 100% access to CDM credits will undermine attempts to de-carbonise Australia. The community wants cuts in Australia, not offsets from outside our borders
- Inadequate funds are recycled into energy efficiency measures.
- The proposed tax cuts are not linked in any way to the burden of the CPRS on low and medium income households, which will blunt their impact in investment in greater cost and energy reduction.
- Compensation to big polluters is being made without clear well established guidelines.
- Voluntary efforts will not impact Australia's emissions, they will simply reduce the price paid for CDM credits.

The Senate enquiry must realise that with the level of CDM credits allowed in Australia there is a chance that ZERO abatement will occur in Australia due to the cost of CDM credits being so low.

I will explain with an example.

The EU restricts CDM credits to approximately 11% of the total credits on issue, which is circa 1.1bn credits.

There are circa 1.5bn credits likely to be generated up until the end of Phase 2 of the EU ETS (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Statistics/index.html>).

That means that any excess credits from the EU market will be available for the Australian CPRS (with no restrictions).

As a result it is feasible that the Australian market could be flooded with cheap CDM credits, resulting in a depressed price for CPRS permits, leading to less abatement and in the end no reduction in Australia's in-country emissions.

This is a serious point that needs appropriate consideration. The Australian Community want real action in respect of reducing Australia's emissions, delivering increased energy security and tackling Climate Change.

You have the opportunity to stop this inadequate, deeply flawed proposal and I ask that for the sake of my generation you do so.

Kind regards
Jeremy Burke

Please please recognise that the 15% upper limit for greenhouse gas reductions is in no way an adequate target. The science of climate change is more or less proven, and to suggest that an industrialised nation such as Australia, with one of the highest per-capita carbon emissions of any nation on Earth, should consider such a low target a viable policy option is sending out a very bad signal to developing nations ahead of COP15 in Copenhagen - please reconsider this target, and set it at a much higher level

Many thanks.

Richard Baldwin

Dear penny Wong, Peter Garrett and Mr Rudd,

As a reasonably well-informed citizen of Australia, I find myself becoming alarmed at the pathetic response of our government to the cutting down of green house gasses. Our country stands to be badly effected by cliumate change: this morning's news mentioned the blue green algae that extends for approx 800km of the Murray river; many towns are dangerously short of water; most of Victoria is in the grip of drought; bushfires, as you are well aware have been shocking, and are likely to be more frequent. We need to act more decisively to cut down our green house gas emissions. 5% is not enough. Please take notice of the concern in the various electorates, and make the target a larger more realistic percentage. Make a scientific decision, not a political compromise. From Heather and Glen Miles, Wangaratta, Vic.

I find the government's 5 to 15% target is not adequate to avoid climate change so dangerous to cause the horrendous bush fires that have happened in Victoria this summer, the floods that have happened and are happening in the north of Australia.

Government of Australia who at the moment I have faith in but am becoming a little unsure of please commit to reducing the greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels.

It is becoming clear with new scientific findings the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt much more quickly than previously thought. It is expected to melt entirely within the next five years, please do something quickly to help combat this. Perhaps spend our defence forces budget on the solutions to climate remedy our changing climate as if we don't we won't have much to defend anyway.

My family are working hard to put in solar energy to our homes and hope this will be completed over the next two years as soon as finances can be organised. But am very disappointed to see that the efforts my family and I are making will be counteracted by big business polluters that are being compensated by the Government's proposed CPRS.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and needs to 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, I believe it will refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

I believe you, The Australian Government is working very hard to correct the wrongs of the previous Government. Please don't let the Australian people down by sticking with this weak 5 to 15% reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution increase it to 50% by 2020

judith guantai

To whom it may concern (which is all of us on earth actually!!)

I believe climate change is the most serious challenge , we as humans face and while I as an individual can do all i can in my power to help the cause we need strong governmental policy to make big changes. So i find it very distressing to think of the governments target being only 5-15% , we should be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much faster than we first thought. It is scary to think that the Artic summer ice is expected to melt within five years.

The CPRS is an unfair scheme which overcompensates polluters at the expense of community and environment. I don't like how all my efforts to reduce my green house emmissions allows others to pollute more. It nullifies my efforts!

Efforts to be more green could actually help the economy in a much more ethical way. It is unethical to continue to consume from the earth as we currently do. Instead solar, wind, etc technologies could be growth industries.

Please please please reconsider your climate change policies for all our sakes.

Yours sincerely, kate Lemmes

Dear Senate,

I am a supporter of increasing the targets for the reduction of greenhouse emissions.

I work with companies and organisations developing the technologies and behavioural change options to achieve these reductions. They are limited by poor and unclear regulation in this sector. Equally I understand that our industries have survived on cheap energy for a long time. We need to accept this will not be the case in the near future as we transition from fossil fuels.

By setting a high target, decent lead times for emissive industries, clear policy we can give investment organisations time to redirect the flow of money.

An additional idea is that rather than give emissive companies money for reductions, give them money that they must reinvest into non emissive generation or efficiency technology companies and projects. They will only care about our future when they have an opportunity to play a roll in the next generation of companies. Dont give them more money to spend on the status quo.

Please set a significant target of at least 25% by 2020 and 40% by 2030. With mechanisms to drive investment into new emission reduction technologies in their own companies and the next wave.

Kind regards
Nick Bruse

It is my belief that the government's 5-15% target for the reduction of greenhouse gases is inadequate and that we should be reducing our countries greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

I urge you to make these changes before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen so that we can demonstrate our commitment and act as leaders in this field for other countries. This will encourage them to take action too.

We should see this as a challenge and attack the issue positively. We can all make a change to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, however we need the government to set strong targets and set legislative standards to reduce overall consumption of fossil fuels and reduce emissions.

The road may be difficult, but we need to make these changes to limit the environmental AND economic impacts in the future. It will be cheaper to make the changes now.

Thank you for taking the time to listen.

Pascal van de Walle

To whom this concerns,

I am a 30 year old woman who lives in Mackay Queensland.

Unfortunately, I have to say that the action on climate change so far is, as I am certain you MUST be aware, just not enough to avoid the catastrophes that have been coming about because of global warming.

Understandably, the planet has seen many climate shifts throughout history, but none as severe as the transformations brought about by the industrial revolution.

We are destroying the lungs of the planet, and the natural beauty/wonders (eg. Great Barrier Reef), because the human race seems to be afraid of any real change, which is totally ridiculous, because the change is CRUCIAL to the continuation of mankind's survival on earth.

I will not continue, as I will probably send you a thesis on the matter, but I will say that the goal of 5% would be laughable if it wasn't so sad and SCARY, that the people who are in charge of making the big decisions, are so focused on the short-term pictures, and focusing more on issues which are important but not critical.

Sorry guys, but WHAT THE HEC ARE YOU ALL THINKING!!!??

Where is the logic?

Where is the common sense?

Where are the plans to truly get through the most serious problem EVER FACED by humanity?

What the hec is going on!?

Where is the vision for workable solutions?

Why are you making pathetic little steps when Global warming is upon us and only going to accelerate more and more and more and more??

When will this stop?

When will we start respecting our only home?

If we destroy Earth, will the governments pay to transport us to a livable Mars, as compensation for their lack of action when it might have made a difference?

Why would we destroy this planet for us and make an unlivable one livable anyway? How much sense does this make?

I hope you get enough letters to make you realise that enough Australians are aware of the dangers we are facing, so that you see it, and

DO SOMETHING REAL ABOUT IT!

Kind regards,
Bianca Hill

To Whom this may concern,

We all know that climate change is happening. The science has been put out there again and again and the devastating effects of climate change have already been seen in Australia.

Australia is a country most at risk from climate change. The Great Barrier Reef for example, could be destroyed by increases in global temperatures. When is the Australian government going to show some proper leadership on this issue?

The Australian people have voted in politicians to take serious action on climate change and not to sit back and wait to see what other countries do. The Australian people are already embracing a sustainable future, so why can't the leaders of Australia do what's in the best interest of all of humanity? Real targets are needed to invest in the future of humanity and avoid climate catastrophe.

C'mon leaders and politicians! Get serious! Get real and set real emissions reduction targets before it's too late because the time to act on climate change is NOW!!!

Sam Millar

To whom it may concern,

Please aim for a more important cut, than the 5-15% cut. If you can afford to give every Australian \$900 to fight a recession caused by financial irresponsibility, then you can spend the same amount protecting us from environmental irresponsibility.

The drastic rate of climate change is no longer controversial and we cannot take the risk of contributing to an out of control system. We must reduce more.

In particular the fact that individual efforts are negated by giving the emissions to someone else is a slap in the face to every well meaning citizen.

Australia has the best possibility in the world to be a leader in solar energy. Please expand the efforts there.

Regards

Ian Spencer
Bradford Electorate.

I believe that climate change has become a critical issue. The 5-15% target is totally inadequate.

Not only is our weather becoming more extreme, we are losing species of flora and fauna and must also consider the millions of refugees who will be displaced if we do not act more boldly.

In a country with so much sunshine, I can't understand why we are not putting more resource into renewable energy.

I implore you to aim for a bigger carbon reduction.

June Jones

I want the Government to set a higher target so that we can do our part in reducing greenhouse gas pollution and avoid the dangerous consequences of severe climate change. There is scientific evidence that shows that climate change is occurring faster than had been predicted so the situation requires more drastic action than the 5-15% target proposed. It is time to refocus the economy into renewable energies. A higher target could help support this change.

Please act now to seriously address greenhouse gas pollution.

Cynthia Spurr, Adelaide

Dear Government,

I voted for you because our planet and our nation desperately needed change. Yet the proposed commitment is not change at all. 5% reduction? Where is any science that shows that this is an adequate reduction in CO2?

Please fix this and do it properly. Why should I do anything to reduce my personal CO2, when you'll just hand any carbon credits to the polluters if I do?

Why should Big Oil and Big Carbon be subsidized for their emissions? How is it that the science fiction idea of clean coal - I'm sure that this is something that comes from Scientology rather than Science - is considered worthy of green subsidies. Please redirect real investment into real sustainable energy futures.

Regards

Clayton Werner - 5126

Please ensure anti pollution legislation brought in is:

*sufficient,

*timely,

*in line with our carbon outputs,

*designed to target toxic polluters

*effective.

Many thanks,

Jennifer Ingleton

Nothing is more important than the environment

Every policy, every economic decision should be made with SUSTAINABLE LIVING ON THIS PLANET as the bottom line.

Stop playing the game of power and greed. Turn it all around. live productively and well IN HARMONY rather than blind profiteering and ignorance.

thank you

joyful margaret anne

The proposed scheme has too weak a target and MUST auction pollution permits. Otherwise big polluters are just encouraged to keep on polluting.

Also need to remove the floor. People and businesses need to be encouraged to do their best.

This is to save our futures. It is happening now. We can't cope with the extreme high temp, severe droughts and bushfires.

Yours sincerely,
Kim Grierson

1. Australia should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels), not a pathetically low 5-15%.

2. New scientific findings are steadily showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

3. Crucial international agreements are being undermined by our weak stance and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

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

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

6. If Australia's total greenhouse emissions from individuals and small businesses are not reduced further than the Government's weak target of 5-15 then this will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap. This is because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall. Ludicrous!

Thank you,

Vicky Hyduke

I am embarrassed and severely disappointed that a developed country with some of the world's leading scientists to call upon has come up with such a low reduction target. This is a tokenistic effort and will not provide the change that is needed to prevent climate change from getting worse.

The government needs to get serious about reducing carbon emissions - we cannot allow big emitters to go on emitting as long as they pay to offset - this is not a long term solution. We have energy from the sun and other alternative sources - we need to seriously invest in these technologies. We also need to look at more demand management for energy - big business users not just households.

Thank you.

Sue Pritchard

It is imperative that we govern for our children and grandchildren and make the hard decisions now. 50% is not too high a target. It will affect some businesses but as we have seen (mostly in other countries sadly) other employment develops out of change.

We need to be putting our wealth (yes we are a wealthy nation) into renewable energy. If small countries like Scotland can set a target of 50% renewable energy by 2020 then so can we.

We should be developing the worlds best zero emmision vehicles, we should be taking the lead from other eg European countries in giving a realistic tarrif back to private supply of renewable energy to the grid. If countries like Germany can make solar profitable then surely Australia can.

Lets do it now before we make it even harder for ourselves and generations to come.

Thanks

Alan Hill

Australia needs to be a stronger voice on Climate change and greenhouse gas emissions - 5%- 15% target is a joke!! Set a stronger target and encourage the growth industries in renewable energy. Make the government see sense and be the leaders we want them to be! The CPRS proposal is going to do more harm than good and overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. The world could look to Australia as the leader in climate change legislation!!!

Tim Jackson

Dear Prime Minister,

In its current form, the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is little more than a token gesture. We need cuts to emissions of 40% by 2020 and to have zero net carbon emissions as soon as possible if we are to lessen the impact of climate change. The current global economic crisis represents an opportunity to create jobs in the renewable energy sector rather than try to avoid job losses in the fossil fuel industry.

The proposed cap and trade system will only enable high emission companies to continue in a business as usual format because all of the emission reductions made by Australian households will simply free up more space in the emission target for polluting industries. A cap and slice system would reward the hard work of Australians by reducing our emissions whilst still requiring the effort of industry.

Rather than sit back and wait for other countries to take action we should be setting an example. Australia has the ability to develop alternative energy sources and reduce our emissions but without strong leadership that will not be possible.

We owe it to future generations to take be proactive and decisive about reducing emissions.

Sincerely,
Michael Gray.

I am in remission from breast cancer, I have an auto-immune condition and I have Multiple Sclerosis, so I don't actually care much what happens to me, I'm fine - BUT BECAUSE I have a grand-daughter who is 6 years old and BECAUSE I care passionately about the wider picture, and BECAUSE we cannot and must not falter in Australia's goal to reduce the pollution that has cost so much already - I beg, expect and demand for all our sakes that Australia commits to a 50 per cent reduction [based on 1990 readings] by the year 2020. For pity's sake, we are better than what has been proposed aren't we? Susan Kennedy,

Dear Senators

I am dismayed by the Rudd Government's pathetic and inadequate response to the Climate Change situation.

The 5-15% reduction target proposed by the Government is a really poor effort. All the scientific evidence continues to highlight the urgency of the Climate Change issue.

The economic cost of drought, storms, floods and bushfires and other "one-in-a-hundred year" events don't seem to make any impression on a government obsessed with business as usual.

Please re-consider the CPRS.

We must act decisively before the damage to our environment, oceans, atmosphere and way of life becomes irreversible.

Yours sincerely

Marie-Anne Lees

Dear Sirs

I write on behalf of my family, including my two sons aged two and six. The proposed CPRS is inadequate to protect our world from dangerous climate change. The 5 - 15 % target is insufficient, we need to do substantially more.

1. Of course we are aware that Australia acting alone cannot prevent climate change, but we wish to be part of the solution, not part of the problem, and believe that we can show leadership to other countries on this issue.... Such a weak target does nothing to promote a useful international agreement at the Copenhagen conference later this year.

2. The scheme itself is poorly designed, and has been corrupted by attempts to pacify polluting industries - the very industries that need to embrace change, both for us and for themselves to survive in the longer term.

3. Most discouraging, the scheme negates the efforts of individuals and families that are trying to make lifestyle changes to reduce our personal environmental impact.... any action we take only allows industry to pollute more.

I look forward to substantial overall improvements in Australia's attempts to combat dangerous climate change. Please don't think that the GFC has altered the community's commitment to minimising climate change.

Yours sincerely,
Jane Cousins

To Whom It May Concern

I would like to make this submission to the Senate select Inquiry on Climate Change.

The Governments 5-15% target is too low, We should commit to reducing our greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels)

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme(CPRS) proposed by the Government over-compensates heavy polluters at the expense of the wider Community.

It will be an embarrassment to the Australian people to take this flawed scheme to the UN conference on Climate Change to Copenhagen in December 2009.

An emphasis on encouraging the implementation of Renewable energy on a large scale should be the major driver of the CPRS scheme.

Setting a strong target and well designed scheme will send a strong message to the International community that we are resolute in our determination to play our part on the International stage to avoid dangerous Climate Change.

Kind regards

Raymond Kennedy

Comment: Dear Mr Rudd,

I am sure you get lots of mail of one sort or another regarding the environment and I am sorry to add to that load.

There is an important point about global warming that does not appear in the media, hence I have to wonder if you have been made aware of it. This point is as follows.

Due to the way that all natural functions work, there always exists a function called inertia. This is the effect one gets when a large ship is travelling on the ocean and then needs to enter port. The power to the propellers is reduced or even shut off a considerable time before the ship needs to commence a turning manoeuvre. Certainly reverse thrust on the propellers can be used but this is uneconomic and is only used in extreme circumstances. Similarly with Aircraft and almost every thing that we humans do.

Global warming is no different in principle, except that with the inertia that we currently have, we have no brakes to put on or reverse thrust to apply. The time period of this inertia is such that IF ALL the steps that need to be done to stop the Global warming were done today, it would take about SEVEN YEARS for an effect to be seen. Cutting emissions by 5-10% of 2,000 levels is nigh on useless, it is like putting your foot under a runaway truck. STOPPING ALL EMISSIONS is clearly not possible. If you doubt my statements check with the best of your environmental scientists. Bear in mind that it has taken a long time for the situation to develop to this point and will take just as long for it to recover. Remember exponential curves, they explain the function of the problem that exists, in as much that the plot of the GW is climbing rapidly in the scheme of things. Have your advisers Plot it and work out what needs to be done.

I therefore suggest that you start the process of explaining to the public of Australia, that there are going to be enormous effects on our weather and hence food supplies, water and most probably electricity in the coming years. Efficient use of all these items is of utmost importance. The current economic crisis is bad, but when one considers the environment you aint seen nothing yet.

You won't find me on the electoral roles because I am a Kiwi. I would not like your job and in any case I could not do it as well as you do. My apologies for dumping this in your lap but you are where the buck stops.

Kind regards,
Ian Maitland.

Hi folks,

I'm really annoyed that the personal choices I make in regards to cleaner energy are helping corporations make irresponsible environmental decisions, with the help of the government. I was hoping that under the Labor government, we would see real action on climate change, and environmental protection.

I would also like to see some areas specifically targeted, like schemes to enable landlords and people renting make environmentally sustainable improvements to properties in a tax advantaged way (otherwise this will never occur). Also, there should be equal or better FBT treatment for environmentally friendly transport methods as there are for private cars.

As a minimum, we need to see policies that allow individuals make their own contribution to the environment in a very real way.

Jay Whelan

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my concern about Australia's weak target emissions goals. It is generally accepted within the scientific community that cuts of around 90% are needed globally to reduce (we can no longer prevent) the impacts of human induced climate change. Australia, as the world's largest emitter per capita and a developed country, has both the responsibility and the resources to cut our greenhouse gas pollution dramatically - 50% of 1990 levels by 2020 is recommended.

If we don't commit to stronger targets, we also risk undermining international agreements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on a global level. Developing countries are likely to see it as hypocritical if we ask them to cut their emissions when we have a significantly higher standard of living, higher emissions per capita, more resources and technology to go towards reducing emissions, and helped cause the problem in the first place.

Thanks for your time,

Catalina Anne Zylberberg

We need a much stronger target at least 50% by 2020. We need strong leadership. We are trying our hardest at the local level by putting in solar heaters and installing solar power. Can you not see the grass roots movement. I guess like usual, the people of Australia need to show you what to do. We elected you - so for our grandchildren's sake - listen up!!! Get going green - help save the planet. Stop all tehpsturing adn talking and tell the big polluters to improve or pay up! Why do we not have more green power? The Australian people know what to do. We can show the world!

Susan Friend

With all due respect, if you and your colleagues don't want to look like a pack of weak-kneed drongos, you really must raise your climate change targets!! They are woefully inadequate. The Howard government would be proud of them.

If you're really serious about reducing Australia's carbon pollution, and are not just posturing to win votes, then get your act together and pay attention to what the voters and the scientists are saying: we are in desperate straits, the Antarctic is melting, and there is no time to waste pandering to the big polluters.

Yours with the utmost sincerity,

I am just another ordinary Australian disappointed by Kevin Rudd's weak commitment of a 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gases. I was filled with hope at his election time talk of making climate change a priority and thought that this would lead to an improvement in Australia's participation in tackling this critical global problem.

However, it seems that I've fallen for some empty rhetoric. I would like to challenge the government to renew my faith in the political system and commit to a target worthy of respect instead of shame.

Thanks,

Rebecca Chapple

To all those who are able to make change happen,

Australia needs to be a leader and set an example by committing to reduce there greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

The present weak targets are undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements. Too long have we delayed, so take action before December's UN Conference in Copenhagen.

Scientific findings show that global warming effects will result in the Artic summer sea potentially melting within the next 5 years. The flow-on changes to the environment may well be catastrophic for the worlds food chain supply, not to mention the displacement of both animal species and human beings.

Australia cannot continue to plug on with its cry for economic recovery without considering a rethink on its planned carbon reduction scheme and making a move to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. People can make changes if they so desire, and so we all must or the next generations will not have the privilidged lives we have had!

Bot my children and I plead that you will all take heed and work with speed to ensure that strong and effective action will occur to make the difference that is necessary today!

Yours sincerely,
Penelope Halford.

Dear Friends

Please accept my submission re climate change. I am very concerned that the targets the government have set are nowhere strong enough to achieve the health of the planet. We need to show a strong example to other countries and take the leadership - you have the will of the Australian people to do this. Please don't sell out to powerful polluters and make the changes that we make like solar power etc worthless by giving the polluters permission to pollute more!! The CPRS is worse than useless and needs to be scrapped so that real change can occur - Please take action so our children and their children can enjoy our beautiful planet, Love Liane

Dear Prime Minister Rudd,

I am writing to express my extreme dissatisfaction at the extremely low target of 5-15% reduction of carbon dioxide your government has set. A minimum of 5% will do almost nothing to stop climate change from occurring more than it already is, while 15% is laughable especially when other major nations across the globe will be doing much more.

We only have one earth and we should take care of it.

Sincerely,

Gary Fan
36 Allambee St
Reid, ACT
2612

your country could still do so much more and has so much potential . put wind mills in the middle of the country , I am sure you could provide whole australia with wind energy. get inspired by european countries, don't look to the usa !!!

I hope you will do a great job.

kind regards

birgit plewe

The Government's 5-15% target only encourages the big polluters, i.e. the coal mines, to keep on polluting at the expense to the community.

The Wilkins ice cap is breaking up, we've have ferocious fires in Victoria, and devastating floods in Queensland. Blind Freddie can see the earth is in trouble.

For heaven's sake, and my grandchildren's sake, please commit to reducing our greenhouse gas pollution to 50% by 2020.

Spend stacks of money on renewable energy, and stop allowing forests in Tasmania to be logged.

Gwen Wilson

* There should be no floor as to where emissions should fall this creates a disincentive to become more efficient.

* If Australia acts to go green ahead of the rest of the world by enforcing higher reduction targets we can create a new industry that is ahead of the globe and becomes more competitive in this field than other late adopters. It is similar to the argument to reduce import tariffs ahead of other countries reducing theirs.

* Climate changes are occurring faster than any of us ever imagined. The real cost has not been quantified but reductions in crop yields, the human and economical costs of natural disasters, the erosion of natural wonders such as the great barrier reef & reduction in air quality are just a few.

The cost of doing nothing will end up being more than the cost of acting now in a significant way. The current target of 5% is pathetic and should at least be 50% below 1990 levels by 2020 in my opinion.

Regards
Paul

Australia is set to suffer greatly under climate change as a dry continent.
This is an ECONOMIC necessity, as well as any other sensible reasons to
address this in a stronger more urgent way.

This is our future that your government is gambling!

Agreed that your policies and plans are more than liberal did or committed to
BUT you need to go stronger or be known as a government that did a little too
late.

This was a major reason of your election success, so follow it up with real
action not just poli words.

Jayne Shephard

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am one of three Australian engineers currently working in Switzerland for a company that provides turn-key lines to produce thin-film solar modules.

I previously worked in the coal industry in Australia on various mine sites in QLD and NSW. It saddens me that in a country, such as Australia, with such plentiful renewable energy and human capital resources that positions in high tech manufacturing of renewable energy technologies (RETs) are few and far between in Australia.

Instead, Australian policy is being driven by large polluters, such as the coal industry. Having worked in the coal industry in Australia, I know that there are numerous technologies to reduce emissions from coal. However, clean coal as it is marketed by the industry is a myth.

What will happen when our customers start to switch a large portion of their energy consumption from coal to renewable energy technology in the next 5-50 years, as other countries such as China introduce significant ETS targets and as more RETs become competitive with fossil fuels?

Unfortunately, not only does Australia's weak target potentially contribute to a delay in the establishment of meaningful international agreement, but it leaves Australia's economy (including the trade balance) dangerously dependent on polluting industries for exports, and on importing transport fuels and later renewable energy technologies.

Setting a well designed policy framework, including an ETS with appropriate targets and sustainable policy to establish renewable energy manufacturing in Australia would: address climate change, create high tech and income jobs, diversify our export base and address the impending trade balance crisis.

A rational approach to risk management would see Australia adopt a GHG emissions reduction target of 50% by 2020 (on a 1990 base). Unfortunately, the existing floor on GHG emission reductions imposed by the low ETS target places a handbrake on voluntary actions to make deeper cuts.

Further, numerous current renewable energy subsidies in Australia are poorly designed. Some of the PV rebates for example are too generous, which leads to over subscription and potential sovereign risk to project developers and manufacturers.

I am calling on the government to show real leadership and transition our economies away from polluting industries, create sustainable "green jobs" and set a policy framework that allows all Australians to do our share to address climate change.

Trent C, Zurich, Switzerland (formerly from Brisbane, QLD)

5% is not even close. Please take this matter a bit more seriously. Can we start with:

1. better public transport & cycle tracks
2. higher registrations costs for gas guzzlers
3. and end to off-peak electricity tariffs
4. mandatory solar hot water
5. tax rebates for solar panels
6. and end to government electricity waste - lights out when buildings are not in use, no 24x7 tea urns, computers and servers off on weekends and at nights
7. mandatory ethanol content in fuel

Thanks

Glen Whitaker

The 5% target is being portrayed as a 'cut in greenhouse gases'. It is nothing of the sort! It is a commitment to continuing to pour 95% as much ****additional**** carbon into the atmosphere as we were doing in 1990. With this target, climate damage will continue to accumulate at a rate that is imperceptibly less than the current rate.

The truck is heading for the wall. How does slightly reducing the continuing acceleration, prevent the impact?

The target ***must*** be to reduce the GHG load, not to reduce the rate of making it worse.

Why does nobody understand this?

Dr Bev M Ewen-Smith

The Government's target of 5-15% is inadequate given the frightening scientific findings we continue to receive about climate change.

Australia could set an example, but rather than inspiring strong action on the world stage, the weak target will only undermine efforts at the UN conference in December.

I look forward to a better designed and more useful scheme that:

- sets a strong target for reducing greenhouse gas production
- includes the efforts of various businesses, groups and individuals to reduce emissions
- does not favour the polluting industries by over-compensating them
- makes it in the interests of those industries to develop cleaner methods of energy production.

Thank you
Helen Martineau

A few pointers:

Carbon sequestration is too expensive and too late and will fail, it will prove a risk for future generations, if there are any.

The greenhouse mafia are worse than the Italian mafia, the kill rate for the coal industry will far exceed that of the cosa nostra.

The Australian public will do far more on its own to alleviate the effects of climate change than the Australian government ever will with its weak 5 - 15% carbon reduction policy.

When my grandchildren are suffering from the effects of climate change in the future they will remember who failed them today. It is almost already too late to stop some of the worse effects of global warming; increased wildfires, rising sea levels, water scarcity, more frequent and much more destructive storms and hurricanes, more severe flooding, increased desertification. Oh, and lets not forget increased species extinction, greater risk of disease, food scarcity and resource wars.

If you agree that we need to save this planet and its people then you need to increase the level of carbon reduction dramatically and NOT favor major polluters with permits. Everyone has to do their bit.

Barrie Frieden-Collins 07.04.09

Dear enquiry and committee members,

My personal opinion is that a 5% target for carbon reduction is so low as to be of no benefit. We need to reduce carbon by at least 20% by 2020 and 80-90% by 2050. A study published in 1973 said that the planet would be uninhabitable by 2050 if we didn't take action then and it is now 2009 35 years later and nothing has been done. Every new assessment that comes out is full of bad news about arctic and antartic ice caps melting more quickly than previously thought, more methane being release form the melting tundras etc etc...

We have the ability to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels for power. We have geothermal for base load we have solar and wave and wind that have hardly been tapped at all. Electricity can be generated from rivers flowing at a few kilometres an hour. So we just need a river to actually flow and there is another opportunity. After we have done that we can think about fanciful schemes of carbon capture and storage which it must be admitted only puts off the problem for another generation to face when erosion reaches that layer of rock or some other tectonic plate movement releases the gas.

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is poorly designed and worse than useless. It compensates the very polluters that should be shutting down in an organised fashion of phasing out by a set date.

We need to send a message to the rest of the world that we are serious about acting effectively on climate change. We should be setting an example and developing the technology that already exists that is 'clean and green'.

please save the planet by acting now.

sincerely,

Ruth Johanne

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to express my concern over the proposed CPRS (Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme). In its current form the CPRS not only does not meet international standards, nor do anything to actually help reduce carbon emissions, but rather when all factors are taken into account it will actually allow for an INCREASE in carbon emissions.

It is unacceptable to implement such a scheme and steps must be taken immediately to significantly change the CPRS to make it effective in addressing the need for carbon reduction.

Currently the following points are of greatest concern;

- The unconditional greenhouse target of 5% emission reductions by 2020 is far lower than the 25% to 40% target range flagged at the United Nations Bali Convention on climate change in 2008.
- It encourages the growth of highly polluting Energy Intensive Trade Exposed (EITE) industries' (such as aluminium smelters) by allocating them 25% of permits free of charge, increasing to 45% by 2020. This is in direct conflict with the recommendations in the final Garnaut report.
- Free permits are given to coal power over the first 5 years. This provides windfall profits to polluters and encourages dirty coal power to continue in the short term.
- Permits are property rights instead of temporary licences. This means that polluters who get them will be paid compensation in the future if more stringent emission reductions are introduced.
- There is no limit on overseas offsets, so Australia's emissions could increase and emission permits bought from overseas to "offset" them.
- The cap on the CO2 price of around \$40/tonne for the first 5 years excludes renewable energy in the absence of other incentives.
- The high "cap" is also a "floor" so emission reductions by households will be simply on sold by power stations to other polluters, resulting in no actual emission reductions.

We have a responsibility as an OECD nation and as members of the global community to positively effect carbon emissions and therefore climate change. We have the technology to make a significant difference what we require now is the will.

I urge you to take direct action now to ensure we do ALL WE CAN to address this situation NOW.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Searle

Climate change is the greatest threat to Australia's security and financial stability. The target has to be increased to 35-50% reduction of CO2 emissions.

This can be achieved by investing in renewable energy sources which will create jobs- often in regional Australia. It will save jobs in the tourist and agricultural sectors which will be decimated by continuing increase in global temperatures. New agricultural practices will need to be introduced.

A 5% reduction in CO2 emissions is not significant.

Urgent, actually immediate, and significant action is required from you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. John Ratcliffe

I am an Australian Citizen and I am deeply concerned about global warming. I am particularly troubled by reports that the Arctic ice is melting and that this may lead to 'runaway' climate change. I am so concerned about this issue I feel reluctant to start a family because I am not sure that it would be fair or responsible to do so.

I want Australia to take effective action to prevent catastrophic climate change but I do not think that the 5-15 percent reduction target set by Government is enough to achieve this. Our commitment should be more like 50 percent by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Worryingly, I believe that Australia's poor target might even undermine international co-operation on this issue by encouraging other nations to also set inadequate targets.

I am doing what I can as an individual to reduce my carbon footprint. I use sustainable transport, eat low on the food chain, buy green power, make responsible use of energy in the home and so on. I am even considering investing in solar panels for my house. However, I was distressed to discover that under the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) such efforts would be effectively meaningless and they would just allow big polluters to emit more carbon.

If we do not have a strong CPRS I fear that not only will this undermine our ability to effectively tackle climate change, but it will also represent a missed opportunity to encourage positive economic growth in renewable energy industries.

I urge you again, for our children's sake, please set some more ambitious reduction targets and implement a carbon reduction scheme that is more likely to be effective at reducing carbon emissions and achieving more sustainable development.

Melanie Montgomery

We need way more than 5% Please set an ambitious goal and an example to the world. Lead the way do not be a reluctant sheep. I mean 5% we all know we need bigger change than that to reduce our human foot print on this world and if we do not do it our children will suffer as we are just beginning to feel the effects we know it will come.

GO FOR 50%

Impossible you say. But just like development applications today if you apply for 50 floors after much community consultation and council negotiations you will get 30 (which is what you really wanted) but if you had of applied for 30 you would only get 20!!!

Go on I dare you. Do what you know needs to be done.

Andrew

I am horrified at the rate of climate change - the more time goes on, the worse the story gets, and the harder it seems to be to tackle it. I look to the Government to stand by its pre-election strong stance on climate change. This is about a future that will happen in all of our lifetimes, and will not care which political persuasion we happen to follow. Australia can show the way with strong targets and well-designed strategies. I respectfully request that the climate policy inquiry consider that any delay, and any watering down of targets constitute major cop-outs. Can Australia lead the way on renewable resources? I think so, and now is the time.

Yours truly
Ann-Marie Deeker

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

New scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea-ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Rowena PERRY and (Dr) Philip PERRY

In 10 years, Mr Rudd and the Australian Government can be fondly remembered as the leaders of the nation who led the world to just head off disastrous climate change. 10 years, not 20 or 30. Or they can be blamed by our children for being too weak to stand up to the naysayers and letting our world slip into chaos. Choose to act, not watch, and make a real effort with a real target for greenhouse gas emission reduction.

Mark Freeman

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). Scientific research is clearly showing that climate change is the major issue of this century. I hope this government can have the courage to have a long term view that my children will look upon and say they made a decision that helped saved the world. The alternative is unthinkable.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is going to be at the expense of the community and needs to be reconsidered

Thanks
Jon Finch

What a disappointment the Labor Government have turned out to be on the things that matter the most. Economic downturn?? Humbug. If we dont have a planet that can sustain the ongoing undisciplined destruction by the world's polluters, we have nothing. Too many people, too much greed, capitalism out of control. Please Labor, put things back into perspective and pull your heads out of the sand. I would trust scientific findings before I trusted the multinationals and others who make money from destruction. I am outraged that polluters are going to be compensated by my taxes. What have they given back to the community. I could write a list of my contributions over the years I have had the privilege to have been on this planet and have not been paid (monetary payment that is) for any of it. Your climate change target is embarrassing and if it wasn't so serious it would be a joke. Nothing less than 50% by 2020 would be good enough, and then it will probably be too late.

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. 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. 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 only option for any intelligent person to take is to apologise for the terrible mistake that has been made and review Australia's target immediately.

Peace, Joy & Respect

Judith Durnin JP

To the Australian government.

The 5% reduction target (15% is purely conditional) is pitiful and weak. It relinquishes any moral authority to lobby other nations to make the reductions necessary to avoid catastrophic climate change. It sells out the opportunities desperately sought by sustainability focused industries and businesses. No amount of window dressing with PVRP and insulation schemes will obscure that. It prevents the efforts of households and individuals from having any effect on the emissions the nation emits with it's cap on reductions. It does all of this largely at the behest of industries and interests which have profited for too long through not paying for the environmental damage they cause, all at the expense of future generations. And perhaps most importantly of all, it does not deliver on the trust the voting public placed in this government eighteen months ago.

In another eighteen months, alarm bells about climate change will be ringing twice as loud as they were prior to the last election and you will have left the gate well and truly open for an opposition party that's prepared to make commitments in excess of your paltry ones.

You really need to fix it, for your electoral hopes, if nothing else. Stick to the science, not the industry heavyweights and union goons.

Bill Ennals.

I believe that the current 5-15% target to cut CO2 emission is by no means enough. The quicker we start our transition the more likely we will be able to save more species more eco-systems, more of humanity. New scientific findings that are almost made public on a daily basis indicate that climate changes might occur much faster than expected. I really urge the government to change its policy accordingly to at least 50% reduction by 2020 and this before the UN conference in December. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme seems an also very inadequate scheme which still does not let emissions fall below certain levels. If one sector reduces its emissions it will actually allow another sector to pollute more. That does not seem a very forward thinking concept in terms of community and industry incentives and education to just simply and generally cut emissions full stop. It is now the time to reduce and stop mining primary resources and instead build up a new and environmentally sustainable economy based on renewable energy. I am very seriously concerned about the climate change issue and urge you to re-new your policy to 50% by 2020 and to also re-new our economy by taking subsidies away from coal mining and transferring them to building a renewable energy and local farming sector. Please let me know what steps you intend to do to move towards a sustainable future before 2020.

Kind Regards

Gabi Bohnet

To Whom it May Concern

I am deeply concerned that the government's 5-15% emission cutting targets are not at all adequate to helping defeat climate change. This should be Australia's number one priority, yes, even before the financial crisis, because we are currently sabotaging our future.

We should strive to become global leaders in climate change prevention, there is a huge amount business that could be developed in the technology for this, truly it could be the business of the future, we do ourselves a disservice in so many ways to adhere to the old ways of over compensating the polluters.

The climate in Victoria where I live has changed so dramatically in the 10 years that I have lived here. Occurrences like the recent bushfires here are to become more and more common if we don't act now. Think how much this is going to cost both in money and in lives if we don't fix it? The cheapest possible action for Australia is to act to fight climate change.

I and many of my peers, elected this government on the strength of their promises to curb emissions and fight climate change. I certainly won't be helping to re-elect them if they don't rectify their promises and show a strong spine globally by setting an example by becoming world leaders in the fight against global warming.

Sincerely

Diana Ward

I did not help to elect the Rudd government to see it break promises on climate change policy. These targets are so weak as to be laughable and make a mockery of attempts by individuals to reduce their own carbon footprints. The scientific evidence is becoming ever more alarming and we're fiddling while Rome burns. The big polluters win again and again we're dragging our feet on developing the renewable energy industries which have already been proven in other countries. Australia must show it is serious about climate change before the Copenhagen conference. It's time to stand up and be counted.

A.Harvey

Personally I am prepared to make sacrifices (and already do by being careful with resources and energy) to reduce my footprint on the planet. I resent the fact that industry can piggy back on the efforts of me and others and use my brownie points.....

Please increase the accountability of industry. Please insist that all new models of cars, heating, white goods are manufactured to reduce energy both in manufacture and consumer use.

Please curtail the use of coal in our own power stations and encourage China and other coal using nations to generate power using our solar and alternative renewable energy systems.

Higher power prices will ensure reduced use.

Encourage additional recycling and a decrease of packaging.

I am surely not the only person who is prepared to work to help reduce energy. I am 65 and a floating voter - I want the current government to do well and to make decisive moves to assist the attack on climate change. I am disgusted by the negativity of the opposition which is floundering from poor policy to even poorer policy ideas. Mr Rudd & his team should courageously attack the climate change problems and it will have my support even if it has financial implications for me personally.

Liz Franklin

Dear Madam/Sir,

Like many other Australians, I have been horrified by the government's weak attempt to cut carbon emissions. Not only has it been weak, but also completely nullifies any effort people might make in saving energy and carbon by making room for industry to increase their emissions. This is completely unfair.

Australia has a wealth of talent to invest in renewable energy and has the potential to become a world leader in this area. Instead of supporting these people, the government appears to be pandering to the coal industry, which is clearly not the way forward.

So many of the government's plans are for short term gain. Saving the environment is about investment, which requires long term planning - that is, setting goals and targets which will save us instead of frying or drowning us.

As someone who voted Rudd into power, I urge the Rudd government to show the world some leadership and to commit to reducing our pollution levels to what they were in 1990.

Yours faithfully,

Jessica White.

The current government target is simply not enough. We must reduce our pollution by 50% by 2020 and we have the means to do so. In fairness to ourselves and future generations we must act now.

I am very concerned that the Rudd government is not fulfilling its election promises. Bushfires we have never seen before, floods, destruction of the Great Barrier reef...there is no time to lose. Act now.

Phillipa Bellemore

Climate change is happening and far more rapidly than the conservative estimates. Australia must have a much greater commitment than that proposed by the Federal government to reduce emissions. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is not adequate. Major polluters but reduce their activity and emissions, however risky this may seem to be to our current economy. In the long term too much will be lost, economically and socially. Total emissions must be controlled with a fair share between all sectors of our community. We must act now, across our entire Nation and all the operations within it. Time to act and save the future as best we can.

Rosie White

I am very concerned that targets need to be ambitious, and will definitely make changes to the way we live, to have any useful effect in reversing the trend of climate change. I believe the general population is looking for a leader to take very strong action. At the moment there is very little incentive to make changes, it is left to the opinion and motivation of individuals. We need the government to be leading the change strongly.

Yours, Libby Goldsmith

Senators, Please consider how important it is for your descendants. if not for yourself that much stronger URGENT Action is required than the half arsed proposals of the government so far. Fear of political backlash over job losses can be assuaged with that seemingly elusive quality...Leadership. We the citizens understand that Everything is dependant on the state of our environment. The problem IS the solution. I propose some big thinking on "a new deal" in green technology and infrastructure building. Jobs lie here. Listen to the scientists and Act now to avoid far worse than we are already experiencing. We have the brainpower, and the willingness to act, please show us the courageous political leadership we so desperately need.Thankyou for considering this. Kaye Melbourne,Farmer, Central Victoria

Climate Change IS the most important issue we face. THE SCIENCE IS CLEAR AND DAILY BECOMES MORE ALARMING.

Why aren't we creating hundreds of thousands of jobs in the Wind, Solar and other renewable industries? The recession IS THE GREAT OPPORTUNITY TO KILL 2 BIRDS WITH ONE STONE!!

These jobs could replace losses in the coal industry

Let's see \$40 Billion on renewables. The Broadband network will be useless if the climate changes are not reversed VERY QUICKLY.

The lack of a gross feed in tariff on solar is an ABSOLUTE DISGRACE
THIS IS A CRISIS DEMANDING A WAR LIKE SET OF CRISIS INITIATIVES

yours

Tim Mahar

There are just NO EXCUSES for not taking SERIOUS ACTION!

I don't care who you are scared of in the industrial and business sector, i'm a young Australian who is thinking long term, and i'm thinking seriously about enviromental action.

We are the kind of people who got your party elected, not to fuss around, but to take ACTION!

Get to it! Look in front of you!

Rosanna

It may already be too late to stop global warming, but it may not . Let us give it our best effort. We only have one Earth, one environment, who will look after it if we won't? Who will suffer if we don't? How will future generations judge us ?
Let us act as one ,

Louise

Please consider carefully the recent article by pre-eminent scientist Tim Flannery in the current issue of THE MONTHLY. Climate change is wreaking havoc already in the delicate populations of both plants and animals in far northern QLD. Some species die if there are just a few days of heat wave.

Please read the article before the senate debate on climate change.

Please! I beg that you do all in your power to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution at least 50% by 2020.

Otherwise, as recent songs by both Antony and the Johnsons and The Cat Empire indicate, 'We're gonna need another world. This one's nearly gone.'

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Mears

For the sake of the world a reduction of at least 50% is the least we can do to lead the planet in reducing greenhouse pollution. Think hard Kev.Peter Kane.

I'm very much afraid that the current model of short term GAIN and long term PAIN has not been understood by economic leaders.

Raise water prices by 300%

Raise energy prices

Ensure the energy companies can't just live on the credits of people that have solar

Forget the stupid credit regime - credit on what? the planet has no credits, it just gets hotter until the ice age.

Dinosaurs were stupid and didn't evolve fast enough? - they were on the planet for 100 million years plus and we have been on it for about ten minutes.

Policy makers - you're weak and rubbish. Crack on with some action that causes short term PAIN. Please.

regards, Lisa

Lisa Ingram

•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

Sincerely,
Shalom Gery

Dear Senators

A poorly designed CPRS scheme is worse than no scheme at all because it can obfuscate the reality that we are achieving little in emissions reductions. We need a strong target for emissions reductions and, if we are to have a CPRS at all, a cap as part of the CPRS and no free permits to big polluters.

It is discouraging and a disgrace that ordinary people who conscientiously cut their carbon footprint will basically be allowing industry to increase their emissions under the current proposals.

Emissions Trading Schemes have not been effective in reducing greenhouse gas pollution in Europe.

We need a carbon tax, a relatively simple mechanism by which people have to pay more for energy use, and this will encourage consumers to cut usage. It should be accompanied by compensation for low income households.

We need large-scale investment in energy generated from renewable sources, which in turn would create employment. Germany employs 250,000 people in renewable energy and energy efficiency!

The current proposals have been influenced far too heavily by vested interests, who would frankly sell all our children's futures down the river for their own short-term profits.

Please prevent this outrageous legislation from being passed in the Senate.

yours sincerely

Professor Neil Ormerod and Ms Therese (aka Thea) Ormerod

The Government's 5-15% target is not enough. Climate change is happening much faster than predicted. We must change our attitude and commitment to emissions. I plead with you to set a strong target. Let's ensure that we do our bit and what better time to do it than now. With the global crisis, Australia could reinvent itself and emerge as a market leader in renewable energy.

I have two small children, all this talk of growth and little talk of the state of the planet leaves me cold. I beg of you to take action now, be strong - this is why you were elected. We need to ensure that we are leaving a planet worth inhabiting for future generations. We cannot afford to miss this time.

Yours sincerely,
Maree Benham

I expected great things from this government. I thought that the Rudd government would be far more courageous with reducing carbon emissions. This is the only chance we have to do something before it's too late! Please Mr Rudd don't screw it up!

Michelle Fisher

To the Prime Minister

The world climate is in dire need of mans intervention to correct the poor decisions of our past generations.

The world economy is also at the brink of a collapse which does not help the situation either. Your decision to hand out money to the people to spend the country out of a recession I feel is the wrong decision. The \$900 is still appreciated as I am a mature Environmental Engineering university student working two seasonal casual jobs. It would have been wiser to spend the money on a diverse range of none fossil fuel based energy creating projects. Proven technology is available to be able to start building wave generation, wind turbine farms and solar arrays. This alternative would have gone along way to gradually turning of the dirty coal fired power stations and create more jobs at the same time.

Mark David Fardig

PLEASE take climate change seriously. It really is an ENORMOUS problem, much greater than the Global Financial Crisis. We need to get serious about reducing emissions and need our Government to show leadership NOW.

Margaret & Ralph Richardson,
Canberra

Com'on guys,

The whole reason I voted for you buggers was because you said you were committed to doing something about the environment - the most pressing issue of which is climate change. Less than a year later your commitment has turned out to be completely limp wristed.

Time to resist the lure of the coal lobby and start making the tough decisions - you still have the mandate of the people.

Regards,
Owen Kruger

The 5% target for greenhouse gas emissions is no way near enough! You'd have thought the government would have realised how very vulnerable Australia is to climate change after the Victorian bushfires this year.

To avoid climate change, I want the government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2020. Also, I am fed up with the government allowing industry to keep polluting, whilst the population is working hard at reducing their emissions. What's the point in me reducing my personal emissions, if the government then goes and compensates industry for their polluting? We should also stop mining coal. I don't care what it will do to employment or the economy - if we can no longer live on this planet, our economy will be useless anyway. How about taking advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy? It's an embarrassment that we lag so far behind the rest of the world in this. We live on the hottest continent on Earth and have let our entire solar energy industry leave our shores. Not good enough, Mr Rudd!!!

I elected the current government because of their promises to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Their target of 5% to 15% is a joke. The current proposal is undermining efforts to form a crucial international agreement at this year's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. Come on, get working on this! The Australian public demands a more proactive approach!!!

Britt Erken

Dear Senators, I am writing to add my voice to the rising number of Australians and people worldwide who believe that climate change is an utterly urgent issue requiring far more serious action than the Rudd government has so far promised to make. I believed that by supporting Labor I would help in moving Australia's government reaction away from climate change denial and into the action that a near consensus of scientists say may already be too late. I urge the adoption of very strong targets for Australia so that we can have credibility in international fora on this issue as well as doing our part as high per capita polluters in a first world country. I also urge reconsideration of the widely aired criticisms of the carbon pollution reduction scheme, with more attention to making polluters pay rather than compensating them, and a stronger approach to ensuring the burdens of moving to a carbon neutral economy is borne equally among the citizens of our country. Let's be world leaders on this! Mary Heath

My family and I have gone to significant effort and expense to reduce our carbon footprint, by installing solar hot water and grid-interactive photovoltaics. It is outrageous that such efforts may be undermined by the current weak 5 - 15% target, which will allow for such efforts to enable polluters to increase their emissions.

Australia should take the lead in developing policy which will seriously tackle climate change. A much more ambitious target should be set (e.g. 50% reduction by 2020), which will give a kick-start to the renewable energy industry and also reduce our dependence on oil, rather than compensating polluters.

Yours sincerely,

Jim and Clare Rourke

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 reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Please consider how 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.

For the sake of future generations please this matter must be addressed!

Kind regards,

Clem Hill

Mr Rudd why have you changed your mind on reducing greenhouse gases, it was 20% and over the last time you appeared on the tv regarding pollution. We must take the lead and not be weak and show other countries we are not wimps and we will do our bit to create a better climate for the future generations. The ordinary battlers are doing their bit. It will be too late if we do not act soon. We also need leaders who will set the example, how many lights and computers and tv have you got on in your home? Why are you building energy guzzling, pollution creating desalination plants. Why can't you set up a commission to look into, all areas of pollution reducing, through re-education, appealing to people to look at car pooling, cycling, using wind power for drying clothes, radio and tv stations to reduce their viewing times, please think what we are doing for the sake of the children of the future. Jack & Rita Frederiks

I commend the government's efforts to acknowledge climate change, and also want you to be more ambitious. I would like to see a %50 reduction by 2020. There is considerable knowledge in all the community now about this, and I believe this target would be acceptable to the majority of people. I am frightened for my children and grandchildren, and ask you to be much stronger, Catriona Milne

Come on guys (and gals)!

Please get serious and deliver a decent carbon reduction target that makes a real difference and shows leadership.

Regards,

Leo Kennedy

I strongly believe that the Government's 5% target for reduction of carbon pollution is inadequate, given the crisis that is imminent for our planet. I realise that greater cuts will require sacrifices, but I and I believe many other Australians would be willing to make such a sacrifice. Lets go for double that target - 10%.

Tim

Hello my name is Anthea Black and I am deeply concerned about climate change.

I feel that the government is doing too little and acting too slowly on an issue that is more important than any other we as human beings have ever had to face. Climate change is bigger than the economy, bigger than jobs and bigger than terrorism. We can not afford to delay putting into action plans that will generally help to stop the destruction of the planet. We need strong targets that will actually help in reducing climate change not targets that are weak token gestures set up by governments in a feeble attempt to try to fool the public into believing that they are "green".

No other time in history have the actions of the government been so important. How can I explain to generations to come that we knew what was going to happen but the government didn't care? Or that the government was so concerned about pleasing big businesses and securing jobs that they are actually stopped the development of new industries and new jobs?

Please increase the emissions targets to 50% our future depends on it.

Anthea Black

All our evidence to date strongly indicates that we need to make deep cuts in greenhouse gases in order to do something about our dire future. This isn't just about politics or business, but the very future of you, me and our all of our family and friends, and our children. How can we hand this mess to our children and not feel deep shame? We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Anything less than this is more harmful than good. Let us be leaders in this and make a real change.

Lisa

Dear Senators

I am dismayed at the lack of inaction by both the current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government. It does not appear to me that politicians care enough about the future of this planet to take the action that is desperately needed. This is simply not good enough and frankly disgusts me.

I would like to see a 50% reduction by 2020 on greenhouse gas emissions on 1990 levels.

I would also like to see companies polluting the environment in order to procure profits heavily fined. The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is simply not good enough. The reality is that business is going to have to make some very significant changes now in order to play their part in ensuring that this environmental situation does not worsen. The Government ought to be bold in ensuring that business treads the line on this.

Further the government ought to be investing in renewable energy and ensuring that Australia is well placed to provide countries all over the world with renewable energy solutions.

I completely support the Australian Greens environmental policies. I think the Senate ought to think long and hard about this issue as if we fail to take adequate action now we will only be forced to take extreme action later at a cost to both the economy and at significant cost to the environment.

I am willing to play my role in this however the efforts I make are all null and void when the Government is weak and pathetic where environmental leadership is concerned.

Yours sincerely

Vasiliky Kasidis

Dear sir/madam,

I am concerned that the CPRS is seriously flawed. As the least populated country on the planet with some of the greatest exposure to climate change related harm, and as one of the highest carbon polluters, we should be taking a leadership position on this issue.

With the proposed CPRS we are sending a clear message to all Australians and other polluting countries that we don't take the effects of greenhouse gases seriously and that we don't care about the potential local and global impacts of climate change.

We should at the very least be equaling the EU and Japan. Even the US appears to be conducting a U-turn. We risk being laggards in the this new economy, when we could be leaders.

I trust the Senate will force the government to rethink this legislation.

Regards,

Teilo Berquier

Climate change is happening. Rudd was elected because many people did not believe John Howard could do the right thing for our environment. Most are not impressed with Labour, however.

Please set stronger targets, and change the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme to one that forces polluters to change their polluting behaviour.

Please do more for our environment.

Yours sincerely,
Katrina Gosschalk.

The Government's 5-15% target is not enough to avoid dangerous climate change. This weak goal is ruining the future of our entire globe. Have some foresight, and think about something other than yourselves, and your re-election for a moment, and raise the emissions reduction target. Secure the future of every generation to come.

Sophie Holland

As 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 is the most worrying aspect of the new scheme, please do what you can to alter this woeful response to climate change.

Regards

Robert Mazzola

Dear Senators,

I call on you to have the courage to recommend deep cuts in carbon emissions in accordance with mainline scientific opinion.

While I'm not an economist, I expect that the effort to cut carbon emissions will create significant economic activity within Australia and give Australia skills that it can export to the world.

--

Regards,

Gary Gaskell

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing as I strongly object to the government's weak target on climate change. The target flies in the face of the science that tells us that we must reduce our greenhouse emissions significantly to avoid dangerous climate change. I think that a target of 50% by 2020 would far more appropriate and show leadership of one of the world's most polluting economies per capita.

The structure of the government's response also disempowers the community in taking personal action to reduce emissions. The only way that we can reduce emissions beyond the targets is to buy carbon permits and tear them up. This is an extremely poor policy response.

The money raised from the sale of permits should also be used to restructure our economy so that it uses low emissions technology to generate power and reduce our ecological footprint as a nation.

Australia needs to face up to the climate change challenge and take leadership in resolving this issue that threatens us all.

Kind Regards

Alison Taylor

I agree that 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).

Look at ice shelf in the Antarctic that is melting. Stop and do something now!

I will vote GREEN next time in the Senate to make sure someone from Family First who has the IQ of an ant does not hold the balance of power.

Paul Bootes

I like many other creatures that inhabit this earth, are concerned about the weak response that this government has had to the issue of global warming. While the flat earthers wallow in there ignorance we cannot afford to wait to start to correct the excessive use of energy in Australia. For the sake of my grand children please put more resources into developing alternative energy sources.

Bert Dawson.

Australia must do its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Ralph Bottrill

I work in Coastal Management here in Queensland. Yesterday, I visited a landholder who was concerned about a coastal foreshore erosion problem on her 100 acre family property. The landholder struggles to pay the inflated rates for her undeveloped property but is determined to maintain the property's conservation values including EPBC-listed coastal rainforest and protect it for future generations.

The problem was that Cyclone Hamish had eroded the 200m foreshore so badly that all she had left was a 4m sheer sand bank. This historically had been a rear dune but now the casuarinas and pandanus were lying on the beach and the coastline left nothing between the beach and adjacent rainforest.

She then showed me a sequence of photos from 1983 to present (which is after our last major storm cycle in the 1970's) with her coastline receding and accreting. But always the foreshore after each successive storm gradually crept further and further back.

Her question was should she rehabilitate or was that just fighting the inevitable? How do we answer that question when the answer honestly is that sea level will continue to rise and rehabilitation will merely buy us a little extra time to retreat. Defending the coastline will leave us with huge environmental problems and how do we prioritise what we save - beachfront mansions or biodiversity? Do we chose to have cities like Hervey Bay become the New Orleans and Venice of Australia? Who will pay to build and maintain our defences and who pays for the untold environmental damage that they in turn will cause?

Even if we arrested climate change today, its been estimated that it will take 50 years before we started to see the environment start to stabilise. That's a petrifying legacy for our children.

We need a brave government and strong leadership to meet the challenge and 5-15% is sending a dangerous message to less developed nations - afterall we're amongst the planet's worse contributors. It's time for action and not inaction - set a target of 50% on 1990's levels to be reached by 2050. It's tough, but future generations will thank you. The alternative . . . a future government may wind up having to say "Sorry" for your mistake.

Sue

I am part of the next generation,
all the mistakes or decisions u make now effect me more than you old folks,
Having such a PATHETIC TARGET is going to do nothing for us in 50yrs time,
THINK REALISTICALLY PEOPLE! GET UR HEAD OUT OF UR OVER PROTECTED FANCY HOUSES
AND TAKE A WALK OUTSIDE A REAL LOOK AT THE BEAUTIFUL TREES, BEACH, THE BREEZE
JUST EVERYTHING AND THINK WE NEED TO MAKE A REAL DIFFERENCE SO LATER ON THERE
IS NOT BIG DIFFERENCE!!!!

love sophie alice callard

Hi,

As an Australian I am disappointed in the Governments weak climate change target of 5-15%, which is not adequate enough to avoid serious climate change, already proven to be happening at a faster rate than previously thought.

If the Government steps up and shows real leadership and sets a strong target with a well-designed scheme, it 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.

I will support a Government that puts its power behind renewable energy and real action in the prevention of climate change.

Thank you for your time,
Radhika Beswick

come on guys 5% is a pathetic target

could so easily be increased by planting bacik some forests and promoting agro forestry

Paul Ferguson
Geologist

The government target of 5-15% is not at all adequate to address climate change. The government was elected partly because they promised ACTION on climate change...where is that action now???) How do I explain to my kids that our 'leader' isn't taking their future seriously??

Please, take action. Future generations are depending on it.
Kind regards,
Inge Light

Like many Australians, I acknowledge the Government's Climate Change Policy will be inadequate in addressing imminent environmental threats.

The target of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 5-15% (on 1990 levels) is unrealistic and an insult to the Australian people who care about the nature of our world in years to come.

The Australian Government has both the potential and the duty to create and implament a more radical and affective target.

Regards
Vincent Bicego

Dear Prime Minister, Ministers Garrett, Wong etc.

I read today in the newspaper about an iceshelf preparing to fall off the edge of Antarctica, with the prediction that scientists are comparing this to events thousands of years ago when Global warming happened much more quickly than would have been predicted. This in a newspaper (The Australian) which is not generally sympathetic to a climate change target at all, because of its impact on business.

I can understand why the Government has hesitated and modified its stance. The political pressure you must be under because of the Global economic crisis is enormous, but unless action is taken on climate change, the impact may be more damaging and intense and for a longer term, than even a repeat of the great depression.

Yours truly,

Rae Desmond Jones

I am extremely disappointed at the Australian government's response to climate change. I assume the 5-15% target has been arrived at on the assumption that to do more will be unpopular. I live in Brisbane where severe water restrictions have been necessary in recent years. I can honestly say i have been astonished at the reaction of the general population to cutting back on water consumption - the facts were given, and people just did what was necessary. Dam levels are now around 50% but people have become so aware of wasting water that moderation and care have become the norm.

Please don't underestimate the general population's understanding of this issue, or their willingness to take action or tolerate changes which the govt may view as unpalatable.

Climate change is not something that will go away, and most people realise that.

And even those who don't, or don't believe what's being presented on climate change, are aware that Australia cannot continue the way we live and consume resources now.

Please set stronger targets.

Robyn Ziebell

In times of war we are able to direct the whole economy plus our human and technological resources in the direction of defence. we are faced with an emergency the consequences of which may be even more serious than war; yet we are doing nothing. Not only are the alarm bells not being rung - We don't even have any alarm bells!

Mike Birch

We cannot afford to take a slow response to impending climate change. As the world bit the bullet to remove hydrofluorocarbons from refrigeration everywhere to help reduce the damage to the ozone layer we can and must do similar with greenhouse gasses. If every country waits until the others make a significant reduction in greenhouse gasses we are doomed. Already the developed world has exported most of its industrial pollution to China by having them manufacturing for us all. Their pollution controls are dreadful, there are clouds of fumes and particulates getting as far as North America, The recent Olympics was a joke - with most manufacturing shut for weeks prior to the event. We need to get the figure of CO2 down to 350 or 300 ppm as soon as possible.

It is time for Australia to show the way and press forward with a 50% reduction in CO2 emissions.

Please stop worrying about your individual re-election prospects and think instead about the whole world populations of people and animals and plants. Extinctions are increasing and we can slow this down.

Thank you

Janet Pyke

Greetings to you all! I wish to make a comment on the proposed Climate Change Policy of the federal government. As a concerned parent I should like to ensure my children's future by committing to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution considerably more than the 5-15% currently proposed by the government.

Australia, as one of the leading first world countries, should be joining other countries in forming crucial international agreement on such an important issue as this AND this must be agreed upon prior to the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December.

We must take a stand on the world stage and show the strength of this government as opposed to the previous weak Howard government. Let us show that Australia CAN lead the way on such an important issue as climate change.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this.

Regards!
MARGARET CHAMBERS-LAW

I want to protest about the 5-15% carbon reduction target proposed by the government. Scientific evidence shows climate change is accelerating more quickly than previously thought. Australia's weak target will discourage other nations from setting higher targets. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme should be critically assessed to determine its real value. It appears to compensate polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. As other nations embrace the new technologies and their economic advantages, Australia's government refuses to move forward.

The CPRS will negate any efforts made by individuals and small businesses to reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the target of 5-15%. Their efforts will, in fact, give room for industry to increase their emissions.

I can not support this government's ill considered target and CPRS. As an Australian citizen I ask my government to look more intelligently at all climate change policies. Sincerely Sally Biffin

The current government tart is not adequate to avoid dangerous climaate,, so I would ask that you consider the view of Australians and re-think legislation to make sure its is all still here for our childrens children.

As climate change is happening much quicker than first thought we need to be pro active as a nation before its too late to turn back the clock.

Renewable energy has the opportunity to provide viable jobs and economic stability in a time of need to our nation.

It is essential that all Australians are forced to participate to ensure our climate does not suffer the long term effects of climate change and that includes business targets to be more significant ensuring that they cannot get worse and force the essential improvement required.

Our country is a democracy so please enact the change need to stop the devastating consequences of climate change that will impact on us all, all Australians will be behind it because we have nowhere else to go.

Kind Regards
Jeanette Peterson

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).

I feel strongly that there are some things we must take seriously now.....and that is climate change is happening right now!!...the economy is important too...but without a planet to live on what's the use of an economy!?

Regards Steve.

Dear Kevin Rudd,

I would like to urge you to take strong action on climate change and set a target that will actually do something. I know you want to take strong action, that's why I voted for you and wore a "Kevin 07" shirt, despite the slack I received.

I know you are receiving a lot of pressure from polluters to set a weak scheme, but there are also a lot of silent individuals out there who would support strong action and won't vote you out because of it.

Tackling climate change isn't a matter of degrees; you either get it right or not. Reducing emissions by 5% isn't going to do a thing - we may as well save our money. Only strong cuts will prevent irreversible and catastrophic climate change.

Please take strong action, you have the power to do it. I don't have the power, but I'll probably have to clean up the mess if this generation doesn't get it right.

Yours Faithfully,
James Tilbury

To whom it may concern,

As a concerned parent of three young children, I urge all senators to lobby the federal government to increase their cap on climate change initiatives from 5% to 20% +.

I voted labour in the lower house at the last election and I am extremely disappointed that they have not raised the figure higher than what they said they would do at the last election.

Yours in anticipation.

Jim McMahon JP

We need stronger targets on climate change and we need them now. alan swatland
BSW

Kevin Rudd was elected partly on his position on climate change. However the current emissions reduction target of 5-15% is NOWHERE NEAR ENOUGH. Australian people understand that dealing with climate change on a "business as usual" agenda is not enough.

New scientific research is constantly showing that climate change is happening at a rate much faster than previously predicted.

Australia's current weak target MUST be improved before December's UN conference on climate change in Copenhagen.

The CPRS is worse than nothing. If this is the action on climate change Kevin Rudd promised in his 07 election campaign, the Australian people have been greatly let down.

It over-compensates big polluters at the expense of the community and environment. It does not determine where emissions will be reduced, allowing coal to continue being dug up from the ground and burnt. The cap does not allow individuals and small businesses the chance to reduce Australia's total emissions further than the weak 5-15% target.

A household may spend \$7000 to install solar panels in their home, with the hope that their own emissions will be accounted for. However this would be futile, freeing up additional permits and allowing industry to increase their emissions; more permits on the market would only serve to decrease the price of permits and decrease the incentive for industry to make the transition to renewable resources!

As an Australian citizen and young person, I fear to hope for a future not devastated by the effects of climate change. When I voted in the Labor Government, I had hope for a brighter future. However, the 5-15% target and CPRS have destroyed that hope. I am disappointed in the lack of real action.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Chan

The Arctic icecap has been disappearing at a rate of over 20% per year for several years now. Do you honestly think climate change is a political argument? While islands in the Pacific disappear under the ocean, you forget that nearly all human population lives near water, most of us at sea level. You forget that a man-made drought is destroying our best food-production areas. You think this is something that will go away if you hide your face in your pillow. It won't. People will suffer. Not just supposedly unimportant people in other countries, who are already suffering. People will suffer here, too.

For our own sakes, if not for the sake of sanity in general, please get a grip and face the facts. We must reduce pollution severely and consistently. We must either produce power by not damaging our world, or learn to live without power and its conveniences. We need to secure an ongoing supply of fresh water and food.

Lead from the front: show us how to make change. Don't wait until the seawater is rising and you're dying of thirst. Don't assume that won't happen, because it will, and much sooner than you think. Unless you commit to reducing Australian greenhouse gases 50% by 2020.

Clytie Siddall

Riverland, South Australia

The Riverland: where our irrigators have at most 18% of the water they need, so our essential local and valuable export markets are collapsing, all our personal gardens have been dead for a long time, and what's left of the Murray River is an unflushed toilet. The Riverland is a huge healthy food resource: it has the least pest-threat (and thus least use of chemicals) in Australia. It has earned enormous amounts for this country, and fed our population. The Riverland is dying of thirst ... while you provide talk instead of action.

Unfortunately the main feeling I have about Australia's long-awaited response to addressing the urgent problem of climate change is despair. After the optimism with the election of the Rudd Government with the messages it sent during the election campaign, I am so terribly disheartened as it appears, after all, to be beholden to the fossil fuel lobby.

What can ordinary Australians do? We know climate change is occurring much faster than previously predicted and the propped CPRS is a very poorly designed scheme that negates the efforts of ordinary citizens to do their bit to reduce carbon emissions.

I implore you to force the Government to set higher targets and develop a scheme that forces industry to reduce emissions and take responsibility and that ensures ordinary Australians feel empowered and rewarded for their efforts.

Yours sincerely,
Michelle Norton

I was so disappointed with the low target the Rudd Government has set for Carbon Pollution Reduction.

Strong leadership is needed so that all Australians will make changes in the way we live and the energy we consume. I would like to see a target of 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). It may not be easy for any of us to make changes, but the melting ice in Antarctica, the long term drought and the increase in extraordinary weather - floods and devastating fires - is warning enough on the price we are already paying for inaction.

The population at large craves leadership - and Australia could lead the way in the world! 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.

Please help Australians towards a way to make the changes we NEED to make to leave a viable planet for our children.

Yours Sincerely,

Claire Gee, Mother of three.

I am concerned the government is compensating polluters in the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. The point is to reduce carbon emissions, not over-compensate so that polluters can continue their unsustainable and dirty practices.

There needs to be a clearer, more effective scheme developed.

I am also concerned that householders efforts to reduce emissions will in effect have no bearing. This is simply illogical, depressing and deeply flawed.

Where is the government with vision I had been hoping and voting for?

Jo Windred

Shorly the recent break up of the Ice Bridge would make the Government review the Envioronment policy ? Jobs....Jobs.... is the "Mantra". Bringing the date forward for the carbon policy would help create more Jobs, with New industries coming on line, this would be incremental as industries grow, as this happens there would be Job losses from traditional energy suppliers, but this would also be a slow process.

For a period of time there would just be an Increase in Jobs. WIN -
WIN:

David Turley.

Hello

I would like the government to take a stronger stance on climate change. The 5-15% target is not enough. We should be committing to 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The government also needs to redesign the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) so all benefit, so the actions of individuals and small business actually make a difference.

Please do something significantly better.

Peace
Scott Griffin

I have heard even quite conservative experts say that a 20% reduction target is achievable.

I want the Australian government to relook at all of the evidence and come up with a much stronger target.

We can do much more with renewable energy and reduce our terrible waste of resources. we need more political will.

Please.

Heather Williams

I am a person excited to have a new solar energy system recently installed... through the energetic efforts of "Power for the People" in Victor Harbor, SA who have supplied 300 homes with cheap solar energy in a "not for profit" scheme. A small effort with big results.

I can think of many ways that the Government's target can be made higher much more easily. It just needs a lot more people to organise concrete happenings and not the airy fairy ideas and all the time and money wasting surveys.

We know what has to be done and the doing is possible.

eg.... the desalination plant in SA. It would be much cheaper and more beneficial to just give each household a rainwater tank and connect it to the house.

Thank you for the green energy rebates. We need to eliminate the greedy manufacturers of the systems though. They do not need to be as expensive as a lot of them are.

If we all band together in a spirit of mutual generosity and caring we may save this planet.

Thanks for reading this... Renate Sommer,

to the senate enquiry into climate change policy

We must begin NOW with strong carbon emission reduction targets!

already some of the symptoms of climate change forecast by the Stern enquiry are reality - much colder winter in the UK and most recently the chunk of iceberg which fell off this week.

Australia must set the example for the rest of the world.

yours sincerely

Janette McLeod

I am writing to request that you re-consider your 5-15% target for reducing our greenhouse pollution, this is simply not enough! There is nothing more important than the state of our planet, the global financial crisis seems to have taken over in the government and media's eyes.

We need to reduce our pollution by 50%, please act on this to save our planet for future generations. We voted for you because we thought you would take a stronger stance on this and have disappointed by your actions so far. Australia need's to lead the way.

Yours sincerely

Lucy Cloonan

Dear Members Of The Senate,

My request is straightforward - please revise your target of 5-15% in reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution. Even in the last couple of days we have information the water levels will rise beyond the level previously expected - icecaps melting at a quicker rate than previously thought. The world is warming. We must take strong action. I have a hope that all is not lost in regards to what we leave our children to deal with and I know that many of you feel the same - many of you have offspring, as do I. I am a single Mother on a low income and I make sacrifices re buying green energy (at a greater cost), don't run a car (although my son would dearly love it but I think public transport is the way to go!), buy locally and organically (something that is seen as the privilege of the well-off) as much as I can, recycle, turn off at the wall, only flush the toilet when necessary - and then with the water gathered in a bucket from the shower.

I believe that people on the ground are willing to sacrifice 'luxuries' if it means a viable future for our children and their children and their children...etc..etc.. DO YOUR BIT AND LISTEN TO US. We will respect you for it and remember that one of the reasons we elected you was the hope that you would be pro-active re CLIMATE CHANGE.

Sincerely,
Mary Regan

We here in Coburg, a working family with two small children, have installed solar hot water, energy efficient light globes, we have spent more money on insulation and sealed our doors, and windows, we are putting solar panels on our roof this year.

At great cost, we are doing our bit, why isn't the government also coming to the party.

We would like to have our children grow up and be able to make their own decision to have children - what are we doing for the future generations.

We have much technology and some great brains in Australia, lets use them to strengthen our standing against climate change,

Thanks,

A concerned Coburg family

Weak climate policy now will cost billions in the longer term. I don't want my tax dollars spent mopping up after extreme weather events that could be avoided by acting now.

Please listen to the science, and act accordingly. I want to see more money invested in proven renewable energy technologies such as solar and wind power, and less in technologies such as clean coal which may never be viable.

Thanks,
Rebecca Dengate

Dear Sir/Madam,

I feel so strongly about the current climate change problems- and the 5% cut does so little. Both industry and individuals need to act now or there will be irreversible damage.

I realise that the current economic climate also makes it hard, but if we continue as we are economics will be pointless.

Please increase these targets, so that green economics starts to become viable, and reductions in pollutants can start properly.

Regards

Joanna Forman

Lets get serious about whats happening in our world. I'm really worried about the situation we are going to leave to our grandchildren if our Government doesnt get really seroius and set some meaningful targets. We are all prepared to make sacrifices but we need the Govt to give the lead it promised us as it went to the last election.

What about it you up there in Canberra?

Des McKenna OAM

To whom it may concern (which is ALL of us)

As a concerned parent and citizen I implore you to please urgently reconsider the weak targets for greenhouse gas emission to which our government has committed. Our children and grandchildren deserve a better outcome for their future on this planet!

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).

Climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

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.

Yours sincerely
Nikki Heywood.

The 5 - 15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. It's obvious that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought; and this is backed up by scientific findings. The Carbon Pollution Reduction scheme is badly designed and will overcompensate polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Please place your priority with the environmental future of Australia.

Sincerely
Peta Laughlin

Get over the weak targets... just commit.
Emma O'Brien

I would like to register my disappointment at the Australian government's low target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution, particularly in view of all the recent evidence that climate change appears to be happening even more quickly than previously anticipated.

I also have reservations about the proposed CPRS which seems overly in favour of polluters.

Australia would seem well positioned to be in the forefront of development of alternative energy sources - why not forge ahead with this?

Frances Ramsay

Hello,

I'd like to add my voice to the growing crowd of people who are prepared to accept (and make!) major changes in order to save our planet. Those with a vested interest in maintaining our current consumerist culture speak loudly, but it is imperative that you listen to the voices of reason, of compassion (for life as we know it!) and responsibility, and act accordingly.

Seriously,
Catherine Styles

My expectation of our Leaders is for them to lead us out of the environmental disasters that previous governments and businesses have got us into through apathy and ignorance.

We need firm and committed guidelines. Please lead us out of the global disaster that many of us are suffering from with health and well being.

Thank you for hearing what I have to say,

Diana Gill

I am really dissapointed at the very low targets set by this present goveernment. I voted for this government to take decisive action. Instead I see them as being beholden to big industry. WE need leadership and bold initiatives. It won't be easy, but we will hve to bite the bullet. Chip Hedges

Dear Senator,

I wish to voice my significant concern in relation to the weak climate change emission reduction targets set by the Federal Government.

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.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Waite

Recent scientific evidence indicates Climate Change is happening faster than previously thought. For this reason I urge you to reconsider the Governments 5-15% target as inadequate and come up with a more effective scheme that will show Australia is taking bold steps to do its part to reduce global emissions.

Australia should be a world leader in renewable energy. I urge you to design a scheme that takes advantage of this new growth industry and one that doesn't compensate big polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

Yours Sincerely

Jon Fieldhouse

Dear Senator

I would like to voice my concern over the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

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 has particular implications for my husband and the small company he works for - a vibrant and growing energy efficiency business based in Frankston, Victoria.

Please take this into consideration during the Senate Select Enquiry on Climate Change.

Thank you,
Felicity Hartfield

Dear Mr Senators,

A 5% emissions target is ludicrous. It is inadequate to avoid climate change which now appears to be progressing at a greater rate than previously anticipated.

In addition the CPRS is fundamentally flawed and will allow polluters to continue with their poor practices while individuals in the community do their best to reduce carbon emissions.

Make a stand for what is right

Sincerely

Michael Fox

Come on Rudd...

Put your money where your mouth is !!

Raise those targets to something that's actually going to stop the world's temperature rising !!

Matt Pearse

There are many flaws in this legislation 2 major ones are
The free permits and property rights for polluters shift all the
responsibility
to the taxpayer and individual.
The 2012 inclusion of cheap biosequestration credits will by Treasury's own
modelling ensure that there are no real reduction of GHGases. Give us the
certainties of a carbon tax Jim Rees

Jim Rees

To whom this may concern

I wish to express concern at the weak targets set by the present government for greenhouse gas emissions reduction. Strong leadership is required by the government to send the right message not only to Australians but to the international community. Before the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen, at the end of this year, I strongly urge the Government to revise the targets, from 5-15% to 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels).

We can do it! It just requires the political will and leadership to focus the creative intelligence of Australia on developing more sustainable forms of energy including transportation. Many of these are already available. They just need to be supported and perhaps adjusted to suit regional needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Climate change is real and needs to be taken seriously. The experts are all saying we need to act fast and strongly, yet the government is ignoring this. Please stop bowing to the fossil fuel industries and act on your conscience.

In 30 years time when some of the damage from climate change will be more evident, each person on the planet will ask themselves "What did I do to cause this, and what did I do to try and prevent this?"

regards

Greg Walsh

The Government's 5-15% target is nowhere adequate to combat climate change . Australia needs to commit to reducing greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. The fact that the government's scheme compensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment is outrageous, unjust, and in terms of our future, criminal.

Australia needs to set a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure we do our fair share to help form a crucial international agreement to combat climate change. We need to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energies to help refocus our economy.

Marion Giles

I applaud the strong stand the government is taking in relation to matters of the economy, most notably today its stand in relation to infrastructure building of the broadband network.

I wish you, our representatives, would take the same strong stand in relation to climate change. We need to show that we are prepared to lead the world and to commit to reducing greenhouse pollution by 2020.

We have been fortunate to be protected from the worst excesses of the global financial crisis, but, I fear that this will not be our lot when it comes to the consequences of climate change. We will be at the forefront of rising sea levels and rising temperature and the consequences.

I am calling on the government to show leadership on this issue and to show that we are prepared to make our contribution with an effective CPRS and a commitment to aspirational targets that show the world we are serious and they should be too.

To be honest I am tired of being asked to turn off lights, recycle, walk not drive (which I do) when the government is being such a laggard on this issue.

Kind regards,

Leanne Cutcher

Dear Sir/madam,

I am writing to express my disgust at the current Government's 5-15% reduction of greenhouse gases target.

This target is clearly inadequate and will have negligible impact on climate change, which new studies have found is happening faster than expected. I am amazed at this Government's cavalier attitude to this. This target undermines efforts to create international agreement and endangers our reputation. As a country with such a high carbon footprint per head we can little afford this. The carbon reduction Scheme that has been proposed is poorly researched and designed and appears to once again favour big business at the expense of the entire country's way of life, only in this case it also will potentially impact on the climate of the entire planet. I cannot believe that you would collectively be so shortsighted as to believe that this is a good idea. You are effectively putting money before life (as extreme climate change will mean that many on this planet will die).

There is no room in this issue for attempting to sit on the fence, moderation will not do here. I entreat you to be bold, raise the reduction target, look at more creative ways to lower emissions. Think outside the square, take a stand. Think of the future, if not yours then your children's, your grandchildren's.

Yours sincerely,
Fay Corthorne

The current CPRS needs re-addressing to bring polluters into line regarding greenhouse emissions and their effect on global climate change which is now negatively affecting our planet in an exponential manner. We Australians MUST commit to a 50% reduction by 2020!! We have a responsibility to, not only the global community, but, also to the non-human species who are both voiceless and powerless to help make changes that are necessary to maintain life on Earth in a sustainable manner. Please act with commitment and strength on this matter whilst representing we, the Australian people... Oh and our environment....which we are NOT separate from!

Raylee Delaney

Dear Senators & other concerned parties

Most Federal MPs are young enough to be able to expect to live another 25-40 years. Many of them have children or grandchildren who can confidently expect to be alive 50-80 years from now. Are our greenhouse targets strong enough to ensure that the planet is still viable for human life in 80 years? What about 25 years; will we still be able to live here then?

I have every confidence in our government that it will make the very best possible decisions for our future, and for the future of this continent, and its inhabitants; I don't think the government is stupid, or short-sighted, or fatally corrupt.

But I have to wonder what's driving climate change policies that appear ~ against the best available scientific evidence ~ to be so weak as to be less than ineffectual; indeed, actually counter-productive in achieving reductions in pollution and greenhouse gases?

Has the worst already happened? Have we already struck the iceberg? I can't help feeling there's something really serious that the government is not telling us: what do you know that we don't know?

Yours sincerely
Deidre Herbert

This Scheme will be expensive and difficult to administer as well as containing too many uncertainties. A carbon tax increasing each year will ensure real reductions with more transparency. jim rees

It is quite clear from actual evidence and new scientific findings that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

I believe the Australian Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should set an example to the rest of the world and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 25-50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). It is time Australia showed leadership in this area and invested heavily and urgently into renewable energy.

Peter Bailey

To whom it may concern:

It seems clear to someone paying even a small amount of attention that there are numerous warning signs that climate change is happening in faster and unexpected ways. Whatever is motivating the weak targets in the CPRS seems paltry compared to the impending natural disaster for millions of people around the world. Australia is rich in monetary wealth, and has the opportunity to learn to grow out of our addictions and form a stronger bond with the world. I urge you to show true leadership.

Regards,
Michael

As the CPRS stands at the moment, there seems no encouragement to me to reduce my emissions; on the contrary the rewards it gives to big polluters encourage ultra cynicism, to the extent that I simply do not believe the claims that institutions make for how they are contributing to carbon emissions reduction. Please either explain why this weak target is necessary, or set one that people can believe in. Furthermore, I find it unconscionable that measures to meet its targets are initiated that take away from developing countries their capacity to grow their own food, by diverting their livelihood into providing a salve for the profligacy of the developed world. In these two ways the CPRS brings criminal injustice both the earth and to its people.

Marguerite Heppell

Financial cycles are just a few short years, and can be reversed with well thought out policies and actions. But even if we take one or two more years to get out of the current mess, we can still survive.

On the other hand, climate change cycles have a cycle time of hundreds, if not thousands of years, with consequences far in excess of any financial ripples, that threaten the very survival of our species. They cannot be reversed in our life time, but we can slow the change and start the reversal process for future generations IF WE START NOW!!!

Please commit to real target that can start to make a change; something like a 50% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020, not the current pathetic and ineffectual 5-15%.

Yours sincerely,
Ron Whitmore

I want to add my concerns about the CPRS. The targets are insufficient and the scheme lacks incentive to reduce emissions for the biggest 1000 polluters - and acts as a disincentive for the voluntary steps to reduce emissions taken by households.

I want my government to take the lead on this vital issue and be smart enough to go back to the drawing board and come up with a better proposal.

Thank you.
Emma In der Maur

Hi,

We would like to see Australia take a much stronger position on climate change.

1/ The reduction target needs to be much higher. A minimum of 15% would be a good starting point but 50% would be better.

2/ There is already significant evidence that climate change is happening much quicker than previously predicted and that the point of no return is close if not already past. There is no economy or jobs on a dead planet. Governments need to finally understand this.

3/ The CPRS is fundamentally flawed. It basically rewards large scale polluters and removes the incentive for individuals to take action. It needs to be replaced by a carbon tax with no exemptions.

Regards

Peter & Clare

Dear Mr. Rudd,

When I voted for you, I had hoped that you would be extremely strong on environmental issues. I just cannot understand why your government has only targeted a reduction of 5%. It is NOT adequate. As a country which is proud of the fact that the global financial crisis has not impacted as heavily on us as on other countries - yet - we should be taking the lead in setting a strong target. I also cannot understand why a CPRS has been designed which compensates polluters - what is the point of all the little changes I have made, along with millions of others, when our contribution is just swallowed up by big polluters?

Yours sincerely

Petrina Slaytor

I have been concerned with environmental degradation issues for most of my adult life. While it is heartening to see environmental issues becoming prominent in the media and politics our political response has been pathetic. I believe most Australians are keen to do what they can but are overwhelmed at the scale of the problem. We need strong Leadership with a strong response. A 50% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020 can be an achievable goal with existing technology and adoption of energy efficiency. I know this as our family has been living a comfortable lifestyle for 10 years by living in a well designed house and solely powered by renewables for all electrical and heating needs. Putting our faith in CO2 geosequestration from Coal power stations is not an answer even if it could be proven. Please do not allow industry to make increases in emissions because individuals have made sacrifices as i have. Please investigate the Governments Current Climate Policy and modify it to give our children the best possible chance in our changing climate.

Regards Robert Clayton

The CPRS appears to be a mechanism to do nothing but circulate money, another market tool that doesn't reduce emissions but has the appearance that action is being taken. This scheme has been tailored for the fossil fuel industry to continue and expand operations.

The alarm bell in the CPRS literature is the phrase "...reduce emissions OVER TIME." Nothing specific, enough spin room to support any outcome that guarantees profits for the high polluting industries and the fossil fuel industries to 2030 AND BEYOND..

The 5% emissions reduction target for 2020 can be achieved by fiddling - there is enough fiddle room with offshore forest credits to do another Howard (ie claim rural clearing reductions to meet a easy Kyoto target).

The fossil fuel industry, associated unions and the big polluters (steel, aluminium etc) are setting the agenda on the threat that they will ship emissions overseas. This is kidspeak - "I'm taking my toys away unless you give me what I want". If only they would (Xtrata, Woodside and the many overseas interests that are here to harvest Australia's resources).

So why did the government back down - Martin Ferguson, the Minister for Resources, Energy and Tourism. His Energy White Paper Strategic Directions builds on his successes to date in emasculating the CPRS, and push for greater CO2 growth.

The real threat of climate change to human existence on earth is just a tokenistic political notion to Ferguson and the energy sector, to be cleverly avoided with White Papers, lobbying dollars and spin.

The reality of climate change is all about us - the Arctic and Antarctic ice caps, the Murray-Darling Basin, glaciers everywhere, the 3mm pa sea rise.

Australia's weak CPRS 2020 and 2050 targets are going to make the job of meaningful international reduction targets all the harder. That means curtains first for Australia.

The CPRS as designed is overly complex, overcompensates polluters, and will not achieve emission reductions. What is the mechanism for compensation translating to mitigation? What mechanism is there to support the desire of the majority of the population to contribute to reducing emissions? There is none. Who loses? The community, the environment and the world.

How on earth the CPRS design channelled the Australian community's own emission reductions to increase polluting industry emissions, seems a very cynical political exercise in manipulation.

A strong, aspirational target and a scheme that really reduces emissions is necessary to support the economy-wide changes necessary to become a low-carbon nation. We can, and should keep our coal in the ground, for the future.

What the CPRS should be, is a path to a firm transition to a low emission economy by 2020, not a deferral of action based on the claim that as we only contribute 1.6% of global emissions, we shouldn't be expected to reduce any emissions in that time - the unambiguous outcome of the current CPRS design.

Regards
Mark Singer

Over the past five years (and earlier) there have been various warnings by highly qualified scientists and researchers about decisive actions to be taken regarding climate change. If we don't act soon it will be too late because there is no second chance. We only have ONE CHANCE.

Peter Clarke

Dear senators,

I am concerned about the current Governemnt response to Climate Change and the resulting policy action. Having voted for this government largely due to their proposed response to climate change I, and indeed many other Australians, feel incredibly let down and cheated.

Firstly, the targets for Co2 emission reduction (5-15%) seem incredibly low. Even now they look embarrassing compared to the response from the new American Administration.

I feel the CCS technology proposed to offset Coal use emissions is misleading in the extreme. The lead time in developing this technology seems to well exceed the available time we have to commit to strong action before conditions change for the worse. It is dangerous to place most of our hope in this technology.

The government has studiously avoided other forms of alternative technology, for example large scale geothermal development and solar thermal plants. It has shown its true colours by its unequivocal backing of the coal fossil fuel industry at the expense of better technologies.

The Australian Government cannot expect to lead any world discussions and actions on Climate change when it "toadies" around the issue at the behest of the fossil fuel lobbies and enthusiasts, which it has done to date.

It is time to make hard decisions, adopt alternative technolgies, and crawl out of our "coal mine" and into the light.

Yours failthfully,

Jeff Sandon

How can any reasonable person deny climate change is upon us. On the news tonight, there was a report about an ice shelf fissuring which was not predicted to occur for another 15 years. Summer is extending from October to early April. Fruit is ripening earlier and flowers blooming out of season. We have water shortages, floods in the north, and fire in the south of the country. The rate of change is happening at a faster pace than it appears was anticipated. For the sake of our Earth and those who come after us, we have to take the hard decisions now. For the past two hundred and fifty years industry has held sway. Industry as we know it is not going to be sustainable into the future. We have to adapt, and adapt quickly. If we fail to adapt and continue on as we are, people will pay a heavy toll in escalating natural disasters, health problems, etc. I have a chronic illness which is exacerbated in the summer. It is because the disease feeds on the production of vitami

n D. Other diseases which induce photosensitivities, such as Systemic Lupus will be on the increase and will manifest in more devastating form. Tropical diseases will appear in more widespread areas. It is time to act now. Governments that are intent on economic growth and feathering their members' nests have vacillated over the matter or simply denied that it is happening. Don't underestimate the people and their ability to punish governments who do not act in the interests of the generality under their governance. We can do the little things like collecting water, installing drippers, half flush toilets, low energy bulbs, insulation and water saving showerheads. We can't do the big stuff.

Denise Testa

The scientific community's best guess is that 450 CO2 parts per million should keep the planet safe. Surely this is the one figure on which the world needs to agree. All other targets such as Australia's 5-15% are irrelevant if not locked into a final greenhouse gas density safety target. Surely we need to begin and end with the science of this potential disaster, not the economics.

Taking a 5-15% target to Copenhagen puts Australia in a very weak negotiating position. Our vast resources of sunshine, wind, wave, geothermals, morally demands us to become a world leader and role model in the development of clean energy. Yet our so-called leaders don't seem to be able to get past the hypotheticals of clean coal and sequestration.

Chas Stabler - Caloundra Qld

I feel I've done this all before, including at the Ballot Box! Start listening: We the people of Australia want the Government of our Commonwealth to undertake to put in place a more substantive target for Carbon Pollution Reduction.

The science is in front of you, the people have made their position clear in tipping out the Lib's (they're still in denial). Why is the Government not relying on the science and listening to what are the vested interests benefiting from the status quo. And 5% to 15% is effectively doing nothing. It gives us no position of leadership to work from bring China & India in as significant and critical contributors to a substantive carbon output cut at the Copenhagen meeting.

Leadership is needed to save the Planet EARTH.

Act now with a significant carbon reduction target for 2020, AND a very significant indicative target for 2050 and give Industry an environment within which they are secure and able to make long-term plans.

Greg Cook

Dear members,

In view of current scientific research and world opinion, I find the current policy on climate change totally inadequate and preposterous. Please demonstrate some leadership and represent the majority of the Australian people to show the rest of the world that we as Australians are also global citizens who care deeply for our planet and its potential to support future generations. Like the public's view when John Howard's Government took us to war in Iraq, in relation to the current Climate Change Policy, I echo the sentiment... "NOT IN MY NAME" - NOT IN AUSTRALIA'S NAME.

Mr Rudd/Ms Wong please get real; set realistic targets and gain some respect for our nation.

Respectfully,
John Peacock

My submission to the Senate regarding the inquiry into the Government's climate policy is simple.

We haven't the time to fly in the face of scientific evidence and forecasts (which are constantly being shown to be too conservative).

No argument in favour of procrastination or minimal reduction targets cannot be countered by the urgency of our situation.

We are in a position to lead on this issue. The "Green-collar" industry is poised to boom, significant foreign leaders like Obama are ready to second our example.

The Australian people, like ordinary little old me, are surprisingly willing to sacrifice economically, even in financially tough times, for radical climate change measures. After all, economic stability is not possible in climatic mayhem.

5% is unacceptable, 10% is unacceptable, 15% is just not good enough. How much better can we do?

Maggie Cowling.

Good day

There is an over invoice payment made to our company which involves some amount of money, so i have decided to involve a second party who i can entrust this money on when i have been able to pull it out my company's account to designated account.

decided to put it before you so you can assist with this situation, We also found out that if the government finds out, the money will be confiscated and transferred into banking treasury. So all i require from you is to lay claims on the funds as all necessary document will be provided to ensure that you collect the funds and move it to you account where we will come for final disbursement.

You will be given 40% of the total funds when we see that there is a success in this deal, the amount involved is \$23.3million i will provide you with the necessary information as soon as you are ready to do this with me.

Please note that all necessary arrangement for the smooth release of these funds has been finalized. We will discuss much in details when I do receive your response.

Regards,

Dr.J.L.Van Genderen

To the Secretary, Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

I am disappointed that the Rudd Government's target to cut greenhouse pollution is so weak - just 5 - 15% by 2020. Australia should be in a position to lead on this issue. 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.

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 \$1,000 for every household in Australia. It seems that all efforts made by households to reduce their own energy use mean that the emissions saved can be added to that allowed for the big polluters. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.

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 am surprised that the Government is not going as far as Ross Garnaut advised, and even that is unlikely to be enough to stop the damaging effects of climate change.

Let's try to work together on the problem to save the earth for our children and grandchildren.

Yours Sincerely,

Joan Carlin

Recent report of Wilkin's Ice Shelf collapse must surely tell everyone that much more needs to be done urgently to avoid serious climate change problems, even if some of it is a natural phenomenon. Nothing happens if we all wait to let others do it, showing astute thinking, even if occasionally wrong, helps others to do their bit.

Australia needs to commit to 50% pollution reduction by 2020, encouragement of householders to go Solar to help, Taxing carbon pollution, developing and using our undoubted brain power to make and profit from new ideas to lessen carbon pollution.

How we ever let our leading solar ideas wither from will to exploit them and encourage our scientists is beyond understanding. Forget cultural cringe and utilise our capabilities are urgent.

We also need to think our ability to rescue our Pacific and Asian neighbours, for instance by adopting them to help fill our own needs for labour, while educating and encouraging our own to go further by effort, education and encouragement.

Alex Wood

The government's response to climate change is manifestly inadequate. While Australia obviously cannot make a significant difference to global emissions single handed, it is vital that we play the role of a leader for the global community on this issue, rather than the role of a spoiler. At present Australia's deplorably weak targets are hampering efforts to form international agreement on serious climate change response. They should be increased before the UN climate change conference in Copenhagen to, at the very least, the levels recommended by the Garnaut report.

Daniel Horsley

I believe that the Governments's present target is inadequate at this stage and that in the light of scientific research should be increased.

Gareth Thomas

To whom it may concern

I want to see stronger leadership on issues of climate change. It is alarming that Australia does not have strong targets in place and well designed plans to execute these goals.

Please make climate change a priority.

Yours sincerely

Lisa Hoppe

I had such hopes for this government to improve the rapid deterioration in climate change. I realise it is hard for you to make the changes you would like but you must think harder and make better solutions. Become a leader, control the coal industry and change the situation.
Patricia Thornhill

My submission to the Senate regarding the inquiry into the Government's climate policy is simple.

We haven't the time to fly in the face of scientific evidence and forecasts (which are constantly being shown to be too conservative).

No argument in favour of procrastination or minimal reduction targets cannot be countered by the urgency of our situation.

We are in a position to lead on this issue. The "Green-collar" industry is poised to boom, significant foreign leaders like Obama are ready to second our example.

The Australian people, like ordinary little old me, are surprisingly willing to sacrifice economically, even in financially tough times, for radical climate change measures. Afterall, economic stability is not possible in climatic mayhem.

Furthermore, the reduction scheme must be aimed at the big polluters. We're already doing our damndest.

And 5% reduction in emissions is unacceptable, 10% is unacceptable, 15% is just not good enough. How much better can we do?

Maggie Cowling.

Dear Senate,

Australia is expected to suffer much from climate change, and it also has contributed generously to making this change happen.

It should now also generously contribute to a sustainable future by having strong targets for the reduction of our greenhouse gas emissions.

We have so much sun, wind and land, and we are not poor. We need to invest in our future, and get a vibrant new energy sector in the deal.

Yours sincerely,
Lennert Veerman, MD MPH PhD

Australia`s Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme has many flaws, not the least being the 5% target, and requires further revision. Please take steps to review the scheme and improve it.

Regards - Roza Passos Faunce

Dear Mr Rudd,

With current climate change escalating, it is imperative that your government makes a conscientious effort to do something now! We are being left behind by the rest of the world. Even China is taking this problem seriously and is moving rapidly towards renewable energy. Europe also is well into using today's technology to produce green energy.

We are frustrated that our Government is not investing in and encouraging private investment in renewable energy, is not giving incentives for energy efficient housing and buildings and is not improving infrastructure to make more efficient transportation (high speed railways between cities and an efficient city network).

We believe that the carbon scheme proposed will not lead to individuals and business reducing their carbon output. It will give them the opportunity to offset their continuing polluting behaviour. A tax on carbon usage we feel would be a far better way to go.

Maree Mills

Hi there,

The problem with all these targets on carbon is that it does not talk about nature and the vitality of nature in the lives of individuals for health, wellbeing and quality of life. Focusing on the techno-managerial aspects overlooks the place of nature in city, urban, rural and wild terrains. It puts nature into the background and makes it invisible - when it's invisible it can be easily removed as people's energies are directed elsewhere.

So by all means call for stronger targets around climate change but do not forget overdevelopment, overfishing, deafforestation and the significance of natural places for human and animals.

with thanks, Sylvie Shaw

To Whom it May Concern,

The Government's proposed 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 recent collapse of Antarctic ice-shelves should act to demonstrate this-- do we really have time to play around to make high-pollution/carbon companies happy? Personally, I don't believe so. The current targets are not sufficient- nor is 'keeping up with the Jones's' Australia is in a unique position to really make a difference- to -be- the Jones's of our region- and I don't believe that should be left to waste when there is so much at stake, when some of Australia's flora and fauna is already under threat due to temperature increase and when jobs could be created through the conversion to greener technologies (Coal is not clean.) and practices.

The more we can reduce our emissions- not just as individuals, but as a nation- the better in the long-run, regardless of other countries reactions.

Sincerely,

Celeste Wheeler.

You must stand up to the coal lobby.

There must be no more coal fired power stations. We have vast amounts of hot rock geothermal energy resources here in NSW, SA and Qld. We just need a government with the guts and foresight to start developing - or encouraging others to develop - these resources that will last far beyond coal power. The 21st century problems need 21st century solutions - not 19th century ones. In this way we will not only be developing new industries (creating more employment) but also going a long way to meeting much more ambitious carbon reduction targets.

WilliamRoberts

In the future we will look back at 5% and say it was not enough, we left the job undone. It may in fact be better to do nothing.

This is now way to leave a legacy for our children - we must do more and we need leadership from our government on this. Dont be afraid, almost everyone believes that more is needed.

Rob

to:the senate select inquiry on climate policy

it is critical that the confluence of peak oil and the broad issue of climate change is not allowed to be downgraded as an important issue in the light of the economic downturn

this economic sunami is essentially a serious short term problem by comparison with these massive long term ones---to set such inadequate targets 15% carbon reduction and the CPRS as currently proposed will not only make australia appear weak and selfish it will allow some of the major polluters to be compensated at the expense of the rest of the community and the environment
yours in expectation john clark

Environmental concerns are paramount. There seems little point in saving the economy if we don't save the earth so humans can be here.

Governments should be looking at ways to engage communities including the unemployed in energy saving and environmental restoration programs.

The targets must be increased in all fields and the tough decisions made to arrest and restore the planet from degradation and destruction.

I want a strong government that takes the decisions to what is needed re carbon emissions, climate change, water resources, waste management, recycling etc.

Dr John Andrews

It is a cliché, but since having our first child, my husband and I have become even more aware of the environmental nightmare he faces in adulthood. Our son Clancy is now 18 months and we often wonder what kind of world he is inheriting as the evidence of climate change (and its effects) becomes increasingly obvious.

We must ALL act now. We are doing our bit at home but the Government needs to support these grassroots efforts with a much more significant target mandated at the national level. We need to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by at least 50%. Otherwise it is going to be simply too little, too late. And sadly, it's our children who will bear the brunt of our folly and selfishness.

We need to set an example, as a developed nation already experiencing the impact of climate change (especially the widespread and devastating drought conditions plaguing the nation).

Please listen to the voices of all Australians and make the target one we can be proud of. Especially because there are so many voices that can't be heard but still count.. Like our son, along with all the plants and animals that stand to lose so much if we don't act decisively now.

Yours sincerely,

Jane McGennicken

When I voted Labour at Federal Election I expected that you where dinkum about taking the hard steps to face-up to the critical challenge of Global Warming.

The Government's 5-15% is a very sick joke. Heck Gannet's recomendation where poor enough, but 5-15% looks simply like cave-in to the coal lobby! As recent UN conference in Copenhargen was talking of zero net emmission by 2050, Australia will need at least a 50% reduction (from 1990 levels) by 2020 to have any hope of meeting the new harder 2050 target.

The State Labor governments where real cowards during the Howard's mob neglect of what is arguable the most critical issue facing Australia. As somebody wisely said, "there is no point worrying about the economy when you no-longer have a livable world to have an economy."

Please, please get real. W. Shawn Gray

Dear Committee,

I urge you to take steps to reduce global warming, by reducing carbon dioxide creation and reducing other greenhouse gasses caused by human activity.

There is ample evidence that climate change is the biggest problem facing human kind, and it is bigger than the financial crisis.

It seems to me that an infrastructure project, like photovoltaic generation on many households and/or offices for example, would be appropriate to stimulate the economy and reduce emissions.

Please put this issue above party politics and do good for us all.

Regards,

John Lock

I wish to strongly protest against the feeble target you are suggesting, to combat climate change.

I believe we are facing the prospect of truly earth shattering effects from man made global warming.

The proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme is worse than useless - it lulls people into thinking action is being taken, when the outcome will not significantly reduce our greenhouse pollution.

We need a 90% reduction by 2030 to have any hope of diverting tragedy.

The Arctic and Antarctic are the fore-runners of dramatic change, and once this gathers pace we will be totally unable to stop it. Life as we know it, will be destroyed, and mankind may not be able to adapt to this new, different world.

There is very little time to undertake the dramatic changes that are needed.

We should certainly be on a war footing, and spending all our time and efforts to address this issue.

One of the most critical issues needing addressing, is the reduction in the human population. (You are obviously aware of the huge effects of a growing Australian population, when you talk about targets of 5% - 15%)

However hard we try to bring emissions under control, this effort is totally undone if we allow the population to increase. We should be immediately offering free contraception and early termination of pregnancy to all - especially those in the third world. This needs to be coupled with increasing education, especially of women, to help drive the reduction in children born.

We only have one planet, and we are destroying it by the insatiable demands of humans.

We have a FINITE world, yet we treat it as if can have eternal growth.

PLEASE LISTEN TO ORDINARY AUSTRALIANS, AND CHANGE THE DIRECTION WE ARE HEADING IN.

Yours faithfully,

Siobhan Holmes

It would be great to see a target of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Mia

Dear Senators,

A brief note to say that despite my advanced age (I am unlikely to see any of the worst aspects of climate change) I am concerned that Australia is not doing enough to reduce carbon emissions and is not giving a lead to other countries that are not as well off as we are. My concern is not just for the future my adult children and my grandchildren face but for those people most vulnerable in Australia and elsewhere and for the future of life as we know it. Our lives, our way of life and our economy depend on our environment which increasingly depends on carbon dioxide levels. In controlling these we may put some people out of work but in not controlling carbon dioxide levels we are putting people out of life. While we can create other jobs for people we can't create other lives for people. Please think beyond the next election and set a meaningful reduction targets.

Regards

Fergus Fricke

Dear Sirs,

The government's greenhouse target is woefully inadequate and the CPRS badly needs to be re-designed to be truly effective. Please show you're serious about saving this planet! We need a 50% cut in emissions by 2020 and no concessions for major polluters!

Regards,
Robert

To whom it may concern

As an Australian and a scientist I would like to see our country take a strong position of leadership on tackling climate change and ocean acidification. We have the intelligence, the wisdom and the technology needed to do this, and as one of the countries that is already being hit by climate change, this is something we must do in order to survive.

I do not understand why our current Government's position is so weak. Perhaps it is a fear that it does not have the support of the people. We have to make some tough choices, but we can do this - we just have to make sure we deal with the issues openly, honestly and with integrity. Our lifestyles will be different but we will be living in cleaner, healthier, more inspiring and more supportive communities

The latest reports show that the impacts of climate change are happening much faster than expected. We must act now to protect Australia, our Pacific cousins and the world.

The Government's current 5-15% target for carbon emissions is woefully inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change and ocean acidification. We must commit to reducing Australia's emissions by 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels). This commitment must be made at or before the Copenhagen meeting.

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

Setting a strong emissions reduction 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.

I look forward to taking this journey with you.

yours sincerely

Dr Cat Dorey