

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.

The target overall is too low to encourage development of long term renewable technologies.

Time is running out. I want the Government to stop pandering to the coal industry and other carbon polluters. Give them the right signals so that they have to make exit plans now.

Regards
Brian Doherty

I totally support the inquiry into the government's climate policy. The 5 to 15% target is not acceptable given the mounting body of evidence that suggests swift and strong action is required.

Sincerely,
Tanya Sykes

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 realise that such a target will require actions considered to be unacceptable by some and difficult to achieve, but the long term result of not succeeding is the eventual extinction of the human species.

ken morton

The Government's 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. As Professor Garnaut pointed out in his report, strong action now will be economically cheaper in the long run.

Australia, as a wealthy, developed nation, must lead the way in avoiding dangerous climate change by committing to reducing our greenhouse pollution by 50% on 1990 levels by 2020.

We must re-focus our economy to maximise its advantage in new renewable energy growth. If we don't, we will be left behind, like General Motors killing its electric car.

The US has indicated recently that it is now looking at stronger action to address climate change. How will our actions measure up? Please don't embarrass us internationally by giving into the coal lobby. Stand up for our future and get strong on climate change prevention.

Yours sincerely
Kim Soo

I'm dismayed that the Australian government is considering such weak targets for carbon emission reduction. More than dismayed - scared.

Recently the government allocated funds towards insulating houses. This is a fantastic move. The only problem is that reducing the carbon footprint on personal housing isn't going to impact on the total amount of emissions from this country. Yes houses will be more energy efficient. But what does that achieve if industries and big business can continue to make up whatever shortfall there is in the proposed targets?

Please consider other more effective measures to make sure our total output is truly and significantly reduced on all fronts. I think it would be reasonable to impose specific restrictions/penalties on industry and big business, that are independent of other measures taken to reduce our carbon footprint.

kind regards
Merridy Pugh

This is to express my dismay that the Government has set such a low target for reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution by 2020. All the scientific evidence points to the need to reduce the levels of pollution by at least 50% by 2020.

I believe that the evidence is there for us all to see - including the rapid breakup of the Wilkins Ice Shelf in the Antarctic. I also believe that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is irresponsible in its proposal to allocate free permits to the big polluters. It is appalling that the scheme proposes to take no account of the efforts of individuals and small businesses to reduce their emissions, and to effectively allow industry to use those reductions to increase their own emissions

For the sake of the planet, please lift your targets and your game!

Regards,

Michael O'Halloran

Emissions trading - Carbon Permits for polluters: Credits must not be free. Australia must set strong targets.

This scheme provides free credits to polluters it is not 'better than nothing' it is a travesty of government. If we must have an 'emission trading scheme Australia must go back to the drawing board and design a scheme that is best practice. Australia should look at what happened in the EU with free credits, the polluters took the free credits and still used the scheme as an excuse to charge the community higher prices.

A carbon emission scheme must and should allow the polluters to gain credits from the actions of individuals and small business to reduce their reliance upon traditional energy consumption by converting to green energy choices. By allowing polluters to exploit this loophole Australia will encourage further green house gases and will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%.The fact is by allowing such action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that already totally inadequate cap.

The Australian climate and situation must be capitalised upon with government championing and investing in and stimulating green and other alternate clean energy and industries. One does not have to research very far to know that the problem of coal green house gas sequestration is not going to be the answer.

In summary, the carbon trading emissions scheme as proposed by the government is not worth the paper it is written upon, it is far too weak to provide for the future the wellbeing and prosperity of Australia. Australia needs to lead not follow the rest of the world.

Suska Scobie,

I urge you to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels) and reassess the proposed targets.

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.

Scientific evidence proves that climate change is a reality and governments need to address the important issue of climate change.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is inadequate and needs to be amended.

Please consider the opportunities for economic growth and environmental benefit yielded by investment in renewable energy.

Yours Sincerely,

Jacqueline Wechsler

As a young person who spent years longing for an end to the backwardness of the Howard era and voted enthusiastically for the Rudd ALP Government in 2007, I was grossly disappointed by the climate change response package announced this summer.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. With even the usually conservative American government committing to reductions of more than 30%, I am ashamed to be a citizen of one of the last "hold-outs" in the western world. Unless the Rudd government commits to a 50% by 2020 target (on 1990 levels), as recommended by leading climate scientists, they will have lost my vote and the votes of many of my peers.

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.

Furthermore, 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. In Victoria, the state government will abandon most of its climate change response measures because under the proposed CPRS they will do no good, and may even do harm. 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. If everything I save at home merely allows big polluters more leeway to pollute, then the system has obviously failed before it has even begun.

In the current environment of economic uncertainty, and with the Australian economy in much shakier a position than is often claimed (due to our propensity to sell mostly rocks and seeds, rather than anything value-added) it doesn't take a genius to see the potential to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. But this will not happen if Australia vainly continues down the fossil fuel dependent path that the Rudd government has set us on. Already far too many brilliant Australian innovations have been lost to our potential green economy.

While change is, as always, an expensive and often scary process for governments, this is a change Australians are ready and waiting for. Disappointment with the Rudd government's action on climate change is widespread, and will come to the fore more fully when economic worries resolve themselves in the next few years.

The Rudd government has a tremendous opportunity at this junction to send Australia down a whole new path, one of clean energy, world leadership in climate change reduction efforts, and (perhaps most excitingly) huge wealth and jobs growth from a new green economy. A government with the courage to take the necessary steps down this path will long be remembered as a great one; one that turns its back on science, throws up its hands to young people like myself, and our children and grandchildren, will be rightly condemned by history and, I hope, soon replaced by one which possesses the strength of conviction to follow this path to its end.

Ben Ellwood

The target is way too low. Ordinary people know we need to do far better than this if we are to have any chance of slowing the warming. We are prepared for any consequences. We have to let go of short term concerns, such as jobs and industry, and look to the long-term future of the whole planet and every living thing on it. Just this week we see an ice bridge collapse in Antarctica and scientists say that we are now looking at a possible sea level rise of up to 6 metres by the end of this century. We need to be doing something positive to combat these changes. Such a small target is just a pretense of action.

Industry has known for many years that change has been in the wind. Why should they be cossetted now by the government when they should have been forward planning to reduce their emissions. There should be no allowance for high end polluters.

Karen Bevis

Please vastly increase the targets for greenhouse gas reduction to 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020. Setting appropriate targets is the only sane thing to do and this will refocus Australia towards becoming a smart country with renewable energy industries. These decisions determine who gets my vote. Thank you, Virginnia Jink Watt.

Dear Sir/Madam

Five to fifteen percent is not an adequate target to avoid dangerous climate change. The target should be at least 50% by 2020 and that is on 1990 levels.

The climate change news that I pick up on (and I believe it is reasonably balanced) indicates that there is a good chance that things are going downhill much quicker than previously thought. It is too much of a risk to set weak targets. There is a good chance that these weak target will in the long term cause us huge problems both environmentally and economically.

Leadership and setting standards are very important in tackling climate change and so I would urge the policy makers of Australia to set strong targets and show the world that we are serious about action and not just lip service.

The CPRS is also fundamentally flawed in that there is a floor on the amount emmissions can be reduced to. This gives an individual like myself no incentive to keep driving my emmissions down when, once we get to the floor, industry will take up the extra emmissions space.

Yours Sincerely

Kent Heard

Dear Madam / Sir

My knowledge of climate change comes from what is available to the public. It is not a deep or expert knowledge. I believe climate change is with us now and that the consequences could be catastrophic for the world and the human race. I don't know if the governments planned target is sufficient or even useful, though there seems to be significant commentary to that effect. I also appreciate that Australia, acting alone cannot reverse climate change. However I believe the issue to be serious and worth this nations every effort to influence for the better. Please believe that this is possible.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Stolp

I am very concerned that the Australian Government's Climate Policy is woefully inadequate.

The 5-15% greenhouse reduction target seems pointless in light of the reductions being called for by most scientists. I acknowledge that reductions will come at a cost, but our lifestyles simply have to change, otherwise we will be in for far more costly in the future. Acting now might see us make a positive from something negative.

I was originally concerned that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme was not strong enough and gave too much to polluters over the community and environment. However, after reading about the operation of the European carbon market and its recent crash I am extremely concerned that it is simply the wrong approach and will generate income for polluters for minimal environmental benefit.

We are a major polluting country but have played a very minor role in working towards a global answer to climate change. I urge the Government to rethink the proposed target and key policy features for achieving it. It is well time we started to take this issue seriously.

Regards
Trudy Green

The government's existing target for greenhouse reductions of 5-15% is embarrassing. We are one of the few very lucky countries that can set the example of a far greater reduction level so that those no so fortunate countries can feel that the advantaged are prepared to not only take the issue seriously but offer hope for their future and a future for this planet. There is too much wait and see about first world country policies; too much fear of the ballot box; too much talk and not enough action. I believe Australians are always prepared to take a stand on issues that both concern them, their children, and the welfare of others. It is our governments that refuse to recognize this fact; that they are there to protect both greed and advantage. The United States now seem to be taking a far more rigorous approach, and so they should considering the use half the world's resources. Let us follow what looks like an Obama affirmative action. Give us a chance to be proud of our cou

ntry for a change; let's commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Thank You

Frank Willmott

To the Senate Inquiry,

I strongly disagree with the Government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme policy. It fails to truly stand up to the challenge of global climate change.

Scientists who met in Denmark in March have reviewed the latest climate science findings. Climate change is accelerating faster than the previous worst case predictions of the IPCC. We need strong action now - delaying cuts until after 2020 is leaving it too late.

The technology to implement large-scale baseload renewable energy already exists. Solar thermal power plants with molten salt energy storage are operational in Spain and California - these can provide continuous baseload power during summer. Along with replacing coal with gas turbines and solar thermal and other renewable energies, the ability to significantly reduce the use of fossil fuels is quite achievable.

However the CPRS will not encourage the uptake of these renewable energy technologies. Giving 90% of permits free to polluting coal companies is cowardly and disgraceful, and will not encourage investment in renewable energy.

Australia has one of the best solar resources in the world - so why are we so myopically focussed on burning through our precious & finite ancient sunlight stores (i.e. coal) with no thought for the future?

Australia is major exporter of coal and has grown rich on the back of exporting our reserves. We have some of the highest per-capita emissions in the world. This is not an excuse to avoid action - this means we are one of the nations responsible for taking the MOST action.

The way that the CPRS will negate individual actions to reduce emissions by setting a 'floor' on emissions, further undermines the schemes effectiveness.

In short, the whole thing needs to be scrapped. Perhaps you could even consider a carbon tax, which is simpler and more transparent, easier to control.

Regards,
Patrick Hearps

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am not happy with the proposed 5-15% reduction on green house emissions by 2020 proposed by the government. It is nowhere near enough, and is not on a par with other industrial countries - it is, in fact a cop out and internationally speaking an embarrassment.

Thankyou for your time,

Regards,

Rebecca Anderson

Australia must lead the way in changing to a green economy. Stern and Garnout both point out in their reports that the cost of the world NOT changing the way it obtains energy far exceeds the costs of changing. We have technologies available now that we can use as we move towards phasing out fossil fuels. If other technologies like geo sequestration eventually become available they can be used later but we would be silly to wait and continue business as usual in the hope that something will come along. All updates from the IPCC point to all predictions being at or above previous predictions and point to a much increased likelihood of catastrophic change. Recent scientific updates for both polar regions show a massively increased rate of warming, arctic sea ice is expected to disappear within five years. Ice sheets in the antarctic are disappearing at an alarming rate. Both these changes will lead to acceleration of worldwide changes. The Australian targets are sending the message to the world, and especially India and China, that all should do nothing until someone else does, a recipe for disaster. The Australian proposals allow the worst polluters to continue harmful pollution, even to the extent that their pollution targets are increased by the amount that ordinary households reduce their pollution. Anything less than a 50% (on 1990 levels) reduction target leads us towards dangerous climate change that will be horrendously difficult to handle. The world is going to have to change to getting energy from renewable sources, those economies that have a head start will be really ahead of the curve in setting up the industries for the new world order.

Mike Giblin

We must move on from coal fired power stations. We no longer live in the industrial revolution. We live in the 21st Century!!!! We have an opportunity to show leadership as a progressive country. We should be aiming for a 50% reduction. We must be focused on what's best for the people and the planet rather than corporations.

Thankyou

Seb Carboncini

The people generally and young people in particular are ahead of the Government in their willingness to sacrifice a bit of their standard of living to cut carbon emissions. Grow some balls and save the planet.
Colin

Please reduce CO2 emmision targets higher than 20% now

Mick Marr

The Labour party's target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution will not adequately address the major problems impacting on our world and our childrens world today. An increased commitment is absolutely imperative - the Australian government should be committing to 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020.

The argument that we should wait until other countries commit to such targets also shows a lack of moral leadership and true commitment. It is essential that countries like Australia show the way, demonstrate leadership and embarrass the rest of the world into action. We need a healthy environment and an economy that supports that environment rather than one that creates more problems for it. Support for new growth industries in renewable energy should be a key government priority.

Please take stronger action to address the problems of climate change for the sake of our future generations.

Delia O'Donohue

I would like to express my support for the aim to reduce greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. I believe that the Government's target of 5-15% is inadequate and will impact negatively on global efforts to reduce emissions. I am concerned also that the CPRS will not benefit the environment because it compensates polluting companies and cancels out the work of individuals to reduce emissions, thus removing incentive to do so.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Marsh

Dear Mr Rudd,

I am writing to you to let you know that I am extremely disappointed by your lack of leadership over climate change. The government's 5 - 15% target is inadequate to meet the challenge of climate change.

Please change your government's weak stance and set some most substantial targets. This is not what I voted for.

Furthermore, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is poorly designed and will do more harm than good. Please, you can do better than this.

Regards,
Peter Chaly

Hi Penny and Kevin

I was so pleased when you were elected, and impressed at your taking action so quickly on items such as an apology to the aborigines.

But on climate change you've been a disappointment. I first felt things were coming unglued when Peter Garret was separated from climate change and Penny Wong installed in his place. Obviously you felt Peter couldn't be trusted, and might actually take decisions that made a difference to the planet, at the expense of the economy.

I'm sure I'm one of many who sees right through you. Your 5% target is farcical. It will make no difference at all to global warming, and gives us no moral high ground at all with big polluters such as China. It's obvious you don't want to upset coal miners, loggers, big business and all the other (self-)interest(ed) groups.

Please - I have 4 kids and I want to leave them a planet as beautiful and liveable as I inherited from my parents. I'm trying to do my bit. Can't you do yours, and lead?

All the best. I wish you courage and resolution.

Iain Hosking

I am writing to object to the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. I think that the emissions targets are too low to have any positive impact on climate change, and that they also fail to provide a clear goal to businesses and the general community in terms of reducing our emissions in a meaningful way. I am particularly concerned that overall emissions are not capped. As a householder who is making significant efforts to reduce my personal carbon emissions (through both energy efficiency measures around the home and behaviour change), it is completely dispiriting to realise that any changes that I make are likely to be ineffective in the face of a policy system that supports the most emission-intensive industries. I would like to see much more stringent targets for reduction of carbon emissions, and I think that the Australian community at large is ready to embrace this. We just need better leadership from Government on this issue.

Tina Wilkie

Australia must set a higher greenhouse reduction target for 2020. I agree with the target of 50% of 1990's levels by 2020 and am comfortable with the challenges that meeting this target would impose when compared to the problems if we do not act.

I have researched this issue in depth and for me reducing the extent of climate change is the most important issue facing our society and government. The following points are worth raising:

- Scientific evidence that we are responsible for dramatic climate change is now indisputable and the trend is towards more drastic changes
- The effects of climate change will devastate the natural environment, industries reliant on natural resources, displace many millions of people and create major health and social/security crises during my lifetime, among other problems.
- We need to do more to support international efforts by adopting greater targets (50% of 1990 levels by 2020 would be ideal).
- The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is significantly flawed and does not promote independent effort. Initiatives by small business, individuals or industries not forced to meet targets should not be counted in the mandatory targets-these efforts should offer improvements beyond the target levels. Cushioning industry from the impacts of their pollution exasperates the problem and does not promote the change to more environmentally viable technology and practices.

Please increase Australia's targets for greenhouse gas reduction, support the international effort to combat climate change and change the CPRS scheme to allow people to make a difference.

Yours sincerely

Kynan Maley

To The Government.

I strongly believe that the CO2 reduction target of 5-15 is totally inadequate in light of the mass of scientific evidence that much greater reduction is required and quicker

After the fanfare of signing Kyoto it must appear to the rest of the world that we are not serious and backward peddling as fast as we can. The CPRS as designed is totally inadequate. As a supplier of electricity from the PV panels on my roof I am incensed that my contribution, along with thousands of other concerned Australians will actually enable power companies to continue to pollute at higher levels and therefore have no net effect on Carbon emissions..

We should be setting an example to the rest of the world. The current scheme appears designed to placate the big polluting industries on the basis that jobs may be lost. In fact it may be better for the world if some high electricity intensive industries such as Aluminium shifted to countries where power is supplied from non polluting sources such as Hydro or Nuclear instead of our dirty coal.

I believe we should be investing much more in developing and installing alternate energy which will create jobs.

I urge you to reconsider your proposed targets and redesign the CPRS to actively promote reductions in emissions so that we can present a credible face at the Copenhagen Conference in December

Roger Ganly

Setting a target to reduce emissions by 5-15% and a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that rewards polluters just makes me feel sick about my children's future. It is simply giving up on our planet.

We need to do better than this, and we can.

Please set more ambitious targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and alter the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme so that we move towards living in a sustainable society so our children can inherit a healthy planet.

Thankyou

Catherine Walsh

Come on, let's take advantage of the opportunity to really make a difference and show the world that it can be done! Australia needs to commit to reducing greenhouse pollution by at least 50% by 2020. Here's our big chance to refocus our economy, developing and encouraging better, cleaner and less energy-using ways to manufacture goods, grow crops and provide services. We must take another look at the CPRS and turn it into a scheme that provides huge incentives for all members of the community to reduce pollutants.

Bonnie Claassen

Senators

The planned CPRS proposed by the government is totally inadequate. It will do little to reduce overall CO2 pollution. We need strong targets and a closing of weak holes that enable polluters to be over compensated. The environmental green actions of individuals, community groups and small business must not be used to offset against targets for large polluters.

Yours sincerely
Max Norden

I am writing to express my hope that The Federal Government's target will be changed to a more realistic 50% by 2020 as the current 5-15% is dangerously inadequate. We simply cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand about this! The saying 'no planet, no jobs' puts it succinctly. We must act now, switch our focus on creating green jobs, particularly within the renewable energy industry. We must not reward polluters in anyway (ie CPRS). Please let common sense prevail.

Cherise Haslam

My fear is that governments are moving much too slowly & cautiously on Climate Change.

We need to develop a stronger solar industry and completely re-configure all government institutions - schools, hospitals etc - to rely less on coal-sourced energy and more on green energy.

Households and non-government industries should also be given incentives to source green energy.

I would ask the government to re-think its Greenhouse gas target and instead strive for a 50% reduction by 2020.

No matter what governments achieve in these times, such is the urgency of climate change, that history will only look favourably upon those governments who act positively to make significant changes.

Jennifer Daly

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to protest the inadequacy of the Government's 5-15% target for the reduction of greenhouse pollution. Climate change is occurring far more quickly than previously thought and drastic reductions are necessary. It is time for Australia to show strength and leadership on this issue. A strong target will show the world that we take our responsibilities seriously and will provide us with an opportunity to focus on growth industries in renewable energy.

The CPRS proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. 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 should be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). If the Government is strong enough and supports this target with a focus on alternative renewable energy industries, Australia will show the world that real action on climate change is possible.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa Paddison

Hello,

I would like to raise some issues with you on the above subject:

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.

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.

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

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

Thankyou,

Leah

Please be a leader and act with integrity and for the benefit of our children and the world instead of short term economic interests. I would rather pay the cost now than have that cost significantly increased in the future (not just the monetary impact). Please take responsibility for our environment and our future.

I am really sad that the government has talked big about climate change in the past but appears to have delivered a very poor and weak policy on the matter.

Please do not put short term economic goals and those businesses that are unsustainable and damaging our environment ahead of the very urgent need to address the causes of climate change.

I would like to see a target of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Please don't allow the business responsible for this pollution to simply pass the additional costs on to consumers as they have said they would. This should eat into their profit margins and ultimately cause them to cease their polluting activities. The current proposal 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.

The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

Please ensure that money made from polluters is put into independent research towards viable alternatives.

I recognize that this has the potential to change the face of Australia's current economy and way of life however, I urge you to consider that often such a painful change results in a new paradigm that surpasses that which we know in the present. Please take strong action.

Yours sincerely
Jo Douglas

Climate change is happening faster than was predicted and is more severe than predicted. Clearly we cannot continue to burn fossil fuels at the current rate, business as usual is just not an option any longer.

A Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme which aims to reduce carbon emissions by 5-15% by 2020 and provides for massive compensation to carbon emitting industries is business as usual. This is way below the target needed to start to address the problems we, as a species, have created and now face.

A target of at least 50% reduction in carbon output by 2020 is necessary if we are to avoid a catastrophe.

Furthermore, in addition to the reduction scheme currently proposed (with higher targets) it is time we got serious and imposed a tax on carbon outputs. This tax could also fund research and development of viable renewable energies and subsidise a renewable energy industry which would not only contribute to reducing climate change, but also foster new industry in Australia which can help our economy in the future. We have a huge opportunity to develop a renewable energy industry just when this industry is bound to take off. It is an opportunity we are currently squandering.

We should be developing renewables as an industry for the future rather than subsidising unproven technologies such as so called clean coal. Solar, wind and tidal power work now, offer a solution now, it's time we invested in proven working renewable technology.

Australia has one of the highest per capita carbon emissions in the world. It's time we grew up and took responsibility for our actions. It's time we set a realistic carbon reduction target, a target which realistically takes account of the latest scientific data and commits us to make the emission reductions which are necessary.

The currently proposed carbon reduction scheme makes me wonder why we bothered to change the Federal government at the last election. The seat I live in is becoming more and more marginal. While my opinions above make it obvious that I will never vote for the conservative parties, if the Labor government cannot seriously tackle climate change I see little point in supporting it and am quite willing to vote informal on the basis of this government's actions on this issue.

David Stover

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is weak and does nothing to enlist the population to share the burden of reducing the impact of climate change.

If I make a contribution by not installing air conditioning or by planting hundreds of trees I do not wish my efforts to count for nought and to give significant polluters the ability to pollute more.

The logical response therefore is for me to do nothing and then blame the government (which in this case would be deserved because of faulty planning). why would I do something knowing that everything I save can be commandeered by someone else?

If I were to save money in a bank account I would feel as if I had been robbed if that balance were taken to extinguish someone else's debt. The government's carbon pollution reduction scheme is no different.

Peter Kent

I am very disturbed that the government's 5 - 15% target for CO2 emission reduction is far too small. Clearly, if such a target were to be adopted globally, then we are heading for a catastrophe.

Prior to the election, the ALP promised that if elected, they would take a position of leadership. I am deeply disappointed that the actions are not matching the words.

How can we expect other nations to save the Barrier Reef, Kakadu and the Murray-Darling if we are not prepared to take a lead and to work towards at least 20% reduction by 2020 and 80% by 2050.

I am amazed also to learn that the CPRS currently proposed seems to reward the big polluters and to continue to place reliance on fossil fuels rather than putting substantial funds into developing renewable energy systems.

Although we are retired people we are trying to do a small part by installing water tanks using low energy lighting and we plan to install a heat-pump hot water system. Yet we are disturbed to learn that such actions by concerned citizens will only make it easier for big polluters to reach their targets.

When we hear Mr. Rudd, Senator Wong and Mr. Garrett speaking on this subject we are not impressed.

The situation is worsening day by day, as is shown by the breaking of the Wilkins Ice shelf this week. How dare Senator Wong use this event as an opportunity to criticise "climate change sceptics" in the opposition, when the Labor Government gives only token action. Is it better to be an honest sceptic or to be a sceptic in action.

From Ruth and Bill Thomas,

I am writing in order to call for a serious thorough practical National Plan to respond to catastrophic climate events in our communities (National Catastrophe Action Plan or NATCATACT). Since the Rudd Government's 5% target is unable to assist in prevention I ask for a ready task force to respond to the consequences of dire inaction.

- I am aware that the Carbon dioxide emissions have previously had scientists predicting a 6% rise in temperatures over a hundred years with sea levels possibly a metre higher. This has seemed like just less of a beach. Scientists are now telling about a six degree rise in the average global temperature being perhaps 78% underestimated and probably going to be happening in considerably less than a century.

- What if the worst occurred- what if the West Antarctic ice shelf which just cracked last week <http://www.reuters.com/article/environmentNews/idUSTRE5326H020090404> raised the global sea levels by over five meters within a 24 hour time period, with the biggest tsunami ever? This shelf is 2,000,000 cubic kilometres of ice just at the end of a glacier completely unsupported jutting out over the ocean. An event that could destroy coastal real estate, leading to further stock market and economic collapses and the destruction of resources and infrastructures making whole cities unliveable.

- Weather experts are predicting more catastrophic weather. What of Australian agriculture if the extreme patterns set up a continuous combination of both droughts and tropical storms?

- Clear felling and burning off are vastly reducing the capacity to reduce the CO2 in the atmosphere. What will we do for trees when the above predicted six extra degrees kills all the Forestry eucalypts?

I ask that the Rudd Government commit to 50% greenhouse reduction targets.

I ask you to promote a Catastrophic Events Task Force within every population centre as a strategic response.

I ask that communities train together, linking up prepared for fire, flood, storm, hurricane, tsunami, earthquake.

I ask that we address climate change especially within every household/industry but at this very late time we need to address possible chains of consequences as prevention is now rather late. Please help to bring out public debate and action.

Yours sincerely, Ruth Howard

Doesn't the Government realise that unless we in Australia take a lead and set strong carbon pollution reduction targets now, the whole world could be in dire straits by 2050. BE BRAVE !! It's what I elected the Australian Labour Party to be. STAND OUT IN THE WORLD AND TAKE A LEAD. People follow LEADERS. LET'S TRY AND GET THE WORLD TO FOLLOW US, by EXAMPLE.

The present CPRS is terrible. You must change this weak targeted policy and set strong targets. Weak targets, no change. WE MUST CHANGE AND YOU CAN MAKE IT HAPPEN IF YOU HAVE THE WILL.

For the sake of my children and my grandchild, PLEASE TAKE THE INITIATIVE AND PUT A STRONG CPRS INTO PLACE.

Jan Dunbar.

Bite the Bullet now or there will be no future for our children.

Increase the target for reducing greenhouse pollution.

Kayla Szumer

The Government needs to lead the way and set higher carbon reduction targets. This will lead to more efficient business, move towards a sustainable economy and ensure there is enough water for us to drink and an environment that we can actually live in for future generations.

The reason I voted Labor at the last election was due to your firm stance on the environment, if the action I expect is not taken you will lose my vote at the next election.

Regards
Giles Perryman

The Government's proposed 5-15% target is completely inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Kevin Rudd promised cuts of 20% by 2020 prior to the 2007 election, and has let the Australian public down on this core promise. I feel deeply betrayed and will put Labor last in my next chance to vote, unless this weak target is changed.

New scientific findings is 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.

Don't use the economic downturn as an excuse for more inaction on climate change: the economy is a sub-set of the environment, not the other way around, no matter how much big business with vested interests will try and tell people otherwise.

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

Setting a strong target with a well-designed carbon reduction 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 currently proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme 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.

Claudia Slegers,

Dear Senators

We believe that the Rudd Government proposal to cut greenhouse pollution by 5-15% by 2020 is grossly and dangerously inadequate, at a time when Australia should be taking decisive action.

In addition, we oppose the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme because it encourages big business to take advantage of the efforts of households to reduce their green house gas emissions by buying up those hard-earned gains. What Australia needs is a system that encourages businesses to reduce their environmental impact, and that has significant penalties for those businesses which are unwilling to reduce their negative environmental practices.

With a thoughtful environmental policy, green industries and services could provide significant new employment prospects and the rapid development of an industry based on renewable energy and reducing environmental impact, an industry which will be increasingly needed in the future.

We urge you to take this opportunity to insist that the government take a much stronger stance on greenhouse emissions, and actively promote employment in the renewable energy sector.

Respectfully yours

Hugh Wackwitz, Mary Williams & Tom Wackwitz

Dear MPs,

Now is the one chance we may ever have to aim for binding CO2 emissions targets that CAN make a difference.

Sadly, the proposed CPRS is not just a slap in the face for voters who voted for Labor's better green policies, but is woefully inadequate to avert exceeding 450 parts per million of CO2 - recognized as the threshold to dangerous climate change.

Kindly increase 2020 targets and get onto 2050 targets, rapidly.

NOW!

Please.

David Sargent

Please Mr Rudd, set an example to the rest of the world and increase the target of pollution reduction in your climate policy before it's too late - if it's not already.

God help us all if the world's leaders can't take strong action NOW.

Elizabeth Finck

I am extremely disappointed with the proposed CPRS. The worst problem, for me, is that the scheme will allow purchase of carbon credits from overseas schemes which will surely be dubious in some cases. If this wealthy and profligate nation is unable to actually reduce (substantially) its own emissions of GHGs, the planet is in terrible trouble.

John Shortridge

"The climatic tipping point is the point at which the greenhouse-gas concentration reaches a level sufficient to cause catastrophic climate change. The point of no return is reached when that concentration of greenhouse gas has been in place sufficiently long to give rise to an irrevocable process. Humanity is now suspended between a tipping point and a point of no return, and only the most strenuous efforts on our part are capable of returning us to safe ground."

Tim Flannery

Dear members of the inquiry panel, please be brave. Think for the greater good and strive to imagine a world which manages to live in harmony with the environment not constant disregard.

Thank you

Patrick Nolan

Dear Senators

As a concerned voter and Australian citizen, I would like the Government to consider the following:

Firstly, the target of 5-15% is laughable when we look at what is facing us. Aren't the fires in Victoria, the floods on the mid-north coast of NSW, and the storm ravages in North Queensland evidence of what that is? Besides, what voice does this paltry target present to the world, from a supposedly dedicated, environmentally-conscious nation? This pathetic effort undermines the world's attempts to face the dangers of climate change. You have no faith in us if you believe that we cannot face the restrictions and discomforts that a tougher target would incur. For us, unlike for many poorer nations, it is not a matter of life and death.

Secondly, your Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) will benefit the likes of the coal and power industries who have brought us to this desperate point, those who have known the dangers for many years and have done little to prepare for it. How can the families of Australia take you seriously when they know that the efforts they make will soften the blow for these pariahs? Are you afraid of their rhetoric and their bluster? Are you afraid you will lose the next election if you present a harder line to us or to them? The voters will support a government who leads and supports them and sincerely makes the tough decisions to get us out of this mess.

On behalf of my family and myself, take an honest bloody stand.

Yours faithfully,

Glenn Warwick

I am 18 years old, i have a girlfriend whos brains i love to mush, i probably wont be having kids, but my brother and cousins will be and i enjoy beer and checking out hot girls on bondi beach as well as camping in the great outdoors

It is for this reason i oppose Rudds flawed CPRS, it will do nothing to actually stop climate change, which will in turn destroy the future of all that
i described above and all that i love

Kieran Adair

To whom It May Concern

You have all our futures in your hands. Mine may not matter so much but my daughter's future and that of her children do. Bowing down to Industry is probably nearly impossible not to do- The pressure to allow them to continue to pollute must be hard to resist- Please be strong put our targets at 25 % and go down in history as being strong in the face of such pressure. You can then sleep with a clear conscience. You have a responsibility to humanity and life itself to act responsibly.

Nicolette Boaz

Dear Sir / Madam,

I'm an Environmental Scientist and find the changing climate and its already obvious effects to be nothing less than scary. I hope to bring my own children into this world one day, to live a healthy, happy life in a healthy community, and do their best to help repair this damaged planet. Now, to not act as swiftly and as strongly as required the government is disadvantaging my children, and everyone else's children, who will one day become the governors of this country. The devastation they will face is phenomenal and almost inconceivable. I am most sincere when I ask you to think naturally, primitively. To ignore a threat to our very existence is fundamentally unnatural. Do your best to combat climate change in the strongest way that you are able. This means to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by 50% of 1990 levels. This chance to act is a small window of opportunity for us all.

Remember, there is no healthy economy without a healthy environment.

Sincerely,
Leah Ilkiw

To the Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy,

There is no time to waste. Climate change is happening NOW! We need far stronger leadership in this area that creates REALISTIC targets. Scientific evidence is showing that climate change is happening FAR more quickly than we imagined. Please think about your children's children and their children. WE DO NOT HAVE TIME TO WASTE.

I URGE you to PLEASE consider setting a stronger target to ensure Australia does its fair share to improve the environment and slow down climate change. This is VERY serious and you must act NOW.

Sincerely,
Kirri Pless

I urge the Senate Select Inquiry to consider increasing the government's target of 5-15% reduction on 2000 levels. In order to have credibility in the international scene we need to do more considering we are one of the highest C emitters per capita.

I ask that consideration be given to altering the scheme so that voluntary action by individuals is additional to the CPRS target. While the impact of voluntary action may not be significant, the educational and political support aspects are critical to future action. People who are disempowered by rendering their efforts worthless are not likely to support strong action down the track that will be required.

I also ask that the level of free permits given to trade affected industries be closely scrutinised to ensure that appropriate pressure is applied to them to reduce their C emissions. The wealth shift from ordinary citizens to large company shareholders needs to be made transparent and defended beyond merely the threat that these companies will take their business off shore without these windfall gains.

Michael Leane

Dear Heads of State

You were elected to represent the people of this nation, you would be failing in your duties by not acting upon the wishes expressed in this and the thousands of other letters you have received. There is no greater problem facing the people of Australia and the rest of the world then climate change. A reduction in greenhouse pollution of at least 50% by 2020 is the minimum you can do. If you can set that target then you will change the world for the better. We can be a model country and lead the world of this dangerous path we have been ingoring for so long.

Please do what you can,
Hugh

I would like to express my profound dissatisfaction with the Commonwealth Government's proposed targets for emission reductions to 2020 under the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. The scientific evidence overwhelmingly supports the imperative for developed countries to reduce emissions by at least 30% below 1990 levels by 2020 if we are to avoid dangerous warming.

Our target (5% unconditional and only 15% if a strong global deal is reached) sends a clear message to the international community that this is not something the Australian government believes is a worthy goal.

I also believe the Government needs to take action to ensure voluntary action by households is additional to the cap, so that the incentive to reduce emissions remains.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Gill

Our planet is in dire need of climate protection. The government's everchanging, and low targets do not address the urgency of global warming. The targets are inadequate, and still allow the major polluters an excessive carbon footprint.

Today;s newspapers showed yet another enormous crack in an ice shelf, and quote halving of the areas of ice masses in recent years, and at rates much faster than originally anticipated.

THE TIME FOR SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION TARGETS IS NOW.

Kind regards,
Yours faithfully,
Dr Maria Heves

The action proposed by the Government under its draft Climate Change Policy and Carbon Reduction Scheme legislation does not address the growing body of scientific evidence pointing to the need for stronger climate change targets. In an effort to concede to business, the draft policy and CPRS legislation has lost focus, direction and ability to impact on the very problems it aims to address.

I urge the Government to place the long term needs of future generations of humans, flora, fauna and ecosystems over the short term business needs presently reflected in the low targets of 5-15% change and the problematic CPRS scheme which compensates polluters rather than providing incentives to make them find new ways to do business in a way that ensures their own and national sustainability. I urge the Government to align Australian targets with those flagged by UN reports on climate change.

THE RUDD GOVERNMENT HAS A MANDATE TO MAKE STRONG CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY - NO OTHER GOVERNMENT WILL BE IN THIS POSITION AGAIN AT THIS POINT IN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY. THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS COUPLED WITH STARTLING EVIDENCE OF THE PACE OF CLIMATE CHANGE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO BUSINESS DIFFERENTLY. IF WE DO NOT RESPECT THE EARTH WE LIVE ON THERE WILL BE NO BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FUTURE. IT IS THE ONLY EARTH WE HAVE FOR OUR CHILDREN, GRANDCHILDREN AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT AND THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CAN BUILD STRONG GLOBAL BUSINESS ALLIES BY TAKING A NEW PATH FORWARD AND BEING A WORLD LEADER ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

PLEASE, PLEASE DO NOT WAVER - IF YOU HESITATE, WE ALL HAVE A VAST AMOUNT TO LOSE.

Sandy Killick

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen of 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.

Very recent scientific finding show that climate change is happening much faster than previously thought and Australia needs to lead the way in tackling climate change before it is too late.

Australia, like the US, needs to be a leader in climate change action and set a much higher target.

Warm regards,
Dawn & Simon Green

We desperately need more serious targets to cut our green house gases. Climate change is such a threat that we need to respond as if we are at war - during the second world war, people knew their existence was threatened and had to accept very large changes to their everyday lives. The threat we face today is not just for our country's freedom, it is for our WORLD's survival as a home for human beings (not to mention the other living creatures of our world) - surely a similar level of change is warranted?

I am seriously considering installing solar panels, at large expense, but I've been put off by the lack of commitment by the Government. What is the use of me saving carbon emissions just so that industry can produce more? I AM WILLING TO MAKE COMMITMENT IF THE GOVERNMENT IS AS WELL.

Instead of wasting money at this time of global economic reform, why can't we stimulate the economy in a meaningful way by encouraging Australian industry in the field of Solar design, alternative energy sources and energy efficient building programs.

Yours sincerely, Dr Jean Foster

To Whom It May Concern,

The issue of climate change is too important to ignore. I call on our government to take stronger, more urgent action by committing to reduce Australia's Greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

The evidence is clear that climate change is real and is happening faster than anticipated. Australia must take clear and crucial action to demonstrate its commitment to ensure a healthy environment for future generations.

Where I live in the Bega valley, people really care about this issue. As a community we have undertaken to committ to 50% clean energy by 2020 and are working hard to make it happen.

Please let our voice be heard and act now while there's still time.

Sincerely,
Kristy Ellis

As a concerned citizen, who is worried about the future we are leaving our children, I strongly urge the government to rethink its current climate change policy. 5-15% as a target for carbon emission reductions is simply not good enough and leaves Australia in a dangerous position. Nothing short of 50% reduction in our greenhouse gases by 2020 is acceptable if we wish to avoid the irreversible effect of climate change.

We have a choice: stick to 5-15% and watch national treasures like the Barrier Reef wither and die or become world leaders in setting a strong target that will tackle climate change head-on. We need to wean ourselves off our total dependency on fossil fuels and start to seriously invest in natural resources like solar and wind energy.

I was very disappointed by the government's proposed CPRS that seems to unfairly reward polluters at the expense of the community and environment. I have been taking many measures to reduce my carbon footprint in the home, as have millions of other individuals around the country, but our reductions would seem to provide the big polluters with an opportunity to offset their own carbon emissions. This is unfair and totally unacceptable.

With the UN Conference on Climate Change rapidly approaching, we must seize the moment to set strong targets. The Australian people gave the Labor Party a mandate at the last election to seriously tackle climate change and so far the government has managed to disappoint. We cannot afford to dither a moment longer: I urge the government to act now - and act with conscience. 50% reductions in carbon emissions by 2020 MUST be our goal.

Yours Sincerely

Sallie Beaumont

Mr Rudd. Our government must commit to reducing carbon emissions to at least 50% of 1990 levels by the year 2020. Scientific evidence now shows that due to positive feedback loops now happening, the effects of climate change now are occurring much earlier than previously thought.

Australias weak targets are undermining world efforts to fight the threat of disastrous climate change.

The governments Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme Kow Tows to the serious polluters at the expense of the efforts of individuals and of the environment. We must set a strong target , not only to show the world that we are serious about climate change , but to compensate to some extent for the inaction and denial of the Howard Government.

Mr Rudd, live up to your promises and show us that you have the will and the courage to lead us out of this frightening situation before it is too late ,sincerely, Ivan and Dawn Hollins.

I am writing to express my dismay at the government's half-hearted response to climate change. The 5-15% target is no response at all.

People are concerned about climate change and are looking for leadership on this issue. Climate change is accelerating; recent news reports about Antarctica highlight this. Urgent action, serious action, is needed and needed NOW. We must commit to serious targets, like reducing our greenhouse pollution by 50% on 1990 levels by 2020.

Our experience reducing water use in Qld during the recent drought shows what people can achieve if leadership, guidance and incentives are provided. There are achievable reductions and people will take them up- but government should take the lead.

It is too easy to look at the obstacles and not the opportunities responding to this crisis in a positive way can provide. There are whole new industries that will develop to address the challenges of climate change. This is where our infrastructure investment should be focussed. The old ways have failed us and we need leaders with a vision for the future to take us forward.

Care must be taken in developing our response to ensure that we do not seek to preserve the status quo and formulate a response that merely placates the power brokers. For example, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

And why is the solar panel rebate means tested? People with higher incomes have the capacity not just to take the handouts but to add to that subsidy and instal a system that meets more of their power needs. But I am also concerned that the proposed changes to the system after 1 July will merely benefit the power companies and not effect meaningful change. And why is the subsidy only available if you feed into the grid? What is the objection to a stand-alone system? Certainly the benefits for the individual are significant, though I recognise there is no benefit to the power companies if we proceed on that model.

I truly believe that we are at a critical point in our history and our leaders have an obligation to make decisions on our behalf that show true leadership and vision. It is in some ways an exciting time- people are so amazingly innovative, we will find the solutions, but there must be visionary leadership to make it happen and make it happen NOW, before we reach the tipping point. We look to you to provide that leadership, to make the government accountable, to move beyond the pitiful 5% targets and address this issue seriously.

Our future and, more importantly, the future of our children and their children, depend on it. Surely no politician who is also a parent can fail to take that responsibility seriously.

Your sincerely
Julianne A-Izzeddin

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

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

Regards,
Coral Gillett

PLEASE DO NOT BE PUT OFF BY THE ECONOMICS OF THIS.

I love business, it is what drives the world and the world I love. But you have to be brave and not be scared about the economics. If we don't have a sustainable world, we have nothing.

Do what it takes, have no fear.

Luella Brookes-Inglis

I think that we need to be doing more for the environment. A target of 5-15% isn't enough. We should be committing to somewhere near 50%. This will cost us more in the long run when sea levels rise and people are made homeless.

The CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the actions individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Governments' weak target of 5-15%. I am shocked that their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap. I have just changed my electricity to green power and I'm being very careful to minimise my electricity consumption because this is not an easily affordable thing for me but I want to do what I can. And here I am being energy wise and I could be contributing to companies just using more. How outrageous!

Please take adequate steps to avoid dangerous climate change.

Regards,

Lauri Kilfoyle

To The Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy:

The time to take real and effective action and change is now. I am a parent, I have two children who are only just starting out in this world. They did not contribute to the climate mess the world is in. It is the big polluters and big business and governments who have. It is now time for THEM, by force of government creed as directed by THE PEOPLE (who voted them in), to start paying for the incredible profits that they have (rather questionably) taken by exploiting the environment. It is exploitative because profits have always been above the two most important things never considered "good business". Firstly, the environment (especially, though not exclusively, in the third world countries under the extremely dubious "structural adjustment programs/projects") and secondly, the workers that toil (especially, though not exclusively, in third world countries) their blood, sweat, tears and sometimes their lives, for the profit of big business. It is time to pay back, fr

om the enormous profits, to secure the future from those that the profits have been reaped from...the workers toil and the safety of the environment.

My demands follow from the Climate Summit from earlier this year in Canberra.

1) Bring the carbon in the atmosphere back down to 300 ppm.

There are many ways this can be achieved. Invest in the (re)new(able) technologies that are being developed, which will also help to solve the economic crisis as the Government can invest in this, as a public infrastructure, and employ the people, who are now currently losing jobs and the workers from carbon intensive industries who can be retrained for such work. What a way to stimulate the economy...saving the planet and jobs and increasing or redirecting production and industry!!

In addition, stop all old forest logging...this is one of the most effective carbon draw down natural methods available, all old growth forests must be immediately protected, for the sake of the planet. This will help to combat bushfire threat as well, newer growth forests burn much more easily and are under greater threat than old growth which have evolved to self-protect from such natural (or otherwise) calamaty.

2) Energy production from 100% Renewables by 2020. It is not impossible, even if the technology isn't there yet....which is why it is important to start investing immediately and heavily into renewable technology....again, helping the economic crisis by creating new demands and employment and therefore waged people who can ... spend, to keep all production going. Renewables should also include examining how agricultural industry operates with appropriate investment to assist environmentally sustainable eco-friendly production.

3) Scrap the current CPRS....this is an execution order for it will see the death of the earth and civilisation as we know it. We already have evidence of things to come, simply look at Queensland's floods and Victoria's bushfires....which, I am proof positive, is only the tip of the "iceberg" to follow. Produce a plan that involves and incorporates renewable energy production by 2020 and carbon draw down to 300ppm...anything less isn't worth the paper it is wasting.

4) A just transition. This follows on from the above, simply put...investing into renewable energy production and industry. Expropriate industries if necessary, they do not need compensation...they have overcompensated

themselves for decades with massive profits at the expense of the environment and the workers who have toiled their lives away "for them". Indeed, the big business should be paying compensation for the damage they have caused. If I litter, ie throw a piece of rubbish on the ground, I would be fined. Why are they not fined for the rubbishing of the environment they have done??? It is time for them to pay, for the degradation of the environment and for the lives this has already cost in the process (look at the third world countries for evidence of this).

I am not a scientist nor an economist, but it seems they have not done the job or either government has not listened to well informed debate, if it has been put forward (and I know James Hansen, as I am sure you are aware is from NASA, has put scientific argument forward that states we must reduce carbon in the atmosphere or we WILL have runaway climate change). As an ordinary person, I know moving in the direction of the solutions I propose, along with countless others, can fix the problems that scientists and economists so far have failed to address, or that government has not heard and failed to implement. I, along with countless others, have the answers. Whilst the technology may not be quite there yet, with the appropriate investment, the technology will be there ... by 2020!!! For some additional funds, how about stopping defense spending as it is currently being directed and spend it on the defense of the environment and a safe world for everyone! There would be e

nough money in that kitty and we would create jobs, increase production and consumption whilst making a safe world....what better a defense strategy and military spending could there be! Okay, we may have to reduce living standards slightly, but what is the point of high living standards for some in a barren and environmentally dead world! How about slightly lesser standards of living that applied to all people in an environmentally safe world. I love the sound of that....and my children do too!!

Yours sincerely

Extremely concerned citizen

Sanna Andrew

and on behalf of my children, and all the children of the world

To Whom It May Concern.

I am writing to express my strong objection and dismay at the Australian Government's proposed target of 5-15% reduction of greenhouse pollution by 2020 (on 1990 levels). This is completely inadequate in my view.

Scientific findings indicate 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, a devastating and frightening thought!

The abovementioned pathetically weak and unrealistic target is a token effort undermining proposed international agreements. It simply MUST be vastly 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 and it will be do more harm than good, in that it would over-compensate 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

All this, from a nation that is under greater threat from climate change than most parts of the planet, is simply NOT GOOD ENOUGH.

I will be most alarmed if the 5-15% target remains as is, not to mention the CPRS and it's ineffective mumbo-jumbo lip-service.

Please think carefully, as we have a whole world at stake, and also a whole world watching our decisions.

Yours faithfully,

David Hirschfelder

Dear all,

do us all a favour and put Australia in front of the world for leadership on these vital issues.

Stop being afraid of business and start to create a better future...increase our emission reduction targets, move firmly away from carbon based fuels and start to seriously invest in regional power creation through solar schemes and creat more regional jobs in the process...the stage is set for somebody to become very real leaders. You have one shot guys...dont drop the ball through fear of industrial lobbies...they are nothing without consumers.

Caspar Brace

Anthea Amore

Although I don't understand the economic sacrifices that need to be made for Australia to improve the current greenhouse pollution reduction goals, I do understand that without a planet that can sustain life there will be no economy.

Regards,

Michael Braithwaite

It is common knowledge that global warming is occurring at a rate far greater than previously forecast by scientific models.

Australia needs to take a leadership role in taking dramatic action now, before it is too late.

A greenhouse gas emission reduction target of 5-15% is too low. The Commonwealth Government needs to set a target of 50% by 2020. This will generate innovation, make our environment safer and more pleasant and hopefully, save the world.

Failure to act for short term political gain, would be extremely negligent.

David Food

I do not believe that the 5 - 15 % target proposed by the government is not adequate to stem the rise of greenhouse gases and avoid a future of further climate based problems.

The recent separation of a large area of the arctic continent from the area demonstrates there is a serious problem with global warming. Rising sea levels will reek havoc around the globe.

Consensus must be reached internationally on targets for all nations to work together to stem this serious threat. Australia's soft target undermines the possibility to reach an international agreement.

Setting a strong target now may be a challenge for industry to conform to. It will though establish Australia as a nation that plays both leading and supportive role to avoid further dangerous climate change.

Setting strong targets will also stimulate the development of new growth industries in renewable energy. This will stimulate the economy, lead to jobs growth and have an ongoing future benefit for the whole planet.

Thank you

James Murphy

Recently CO2 reduction targets were revised to 60% by 2020 in order to stop the levels in the atmosphere from hitting 450ppm, the considered tipping point.

This government was elected on promises to tackle climate change and this dismal target of 5 - 15% reduction by 2020 is not only a broken pledge but also global embarrassment for all Australians.

Quite simply, there is nothing more important than addressing climate change and economic growth is the main cause. We need to achieve a minimum reduction of 60% by 2020 to play our part and government must accept economic contraction is a vital part of that process.

The good people realise they must make and accept sacrifices but it's for the government to implement those changes and fairly.

There is no more time left, please do the job you were elected to do before nature takes away that option for all of us.

Regards,

Ken Groves

I write to voice a concern about the proposed CPRS. As I understand it, given the current target for greenhouse pollution reduction of between 5 and 15 percent, any actions I take to reduce my own personal contribution towards greenhouse emissions beyond the target are not actually beneficial to the environment at all, rather they will simply allow polluting industries to increase their own emissions to make up the difference. This is a major deficiency with the scheme and a strong disincentive to positive action on the part of individuals and small businesses. I strongly object to the overly generous treatment that big polluters will receive under this scheme. I look forward to this being remedied. Regards,

Jon Nielsen

The Government's 5-15% reduction target is inadequate, and needs to be higher, at least 20+%

The CPRS is flawed, as efforts made by individuals such as myself to reduce our 'carbon footprint' merely free up permits for polluters to continue to pollute.

Big polluters should not receive preferential treatment or exemptions from the reduction target

We need bold decisions, not timid and excuse ridden suggestions. All of us, including the Corporates and the big polluters need to substantially change.

Paul

The reason you were voted in as a government was that you were a political party that actually indicated it would lead - not just manage our country. Making a bigger commitment to cutting greenhouse emissions isn't just a good thing to do - it is the RIGHT thing to do.

Our country needs to lead on this matter. Please do all you can.

Peter

To Whom It May Concern:

The 5-15% target proposed by the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is inadequate to deal with prospects of dangerous climate change. While The Stern Report advocated that a 60% reduction in carbon emissions by 2020 from 1990 levels would be required to meet a target of 550ppm Co2 equivalent (and thereby limit the increase in global average temperatures to 3 degrees celcius) current developments suggest that the world must reduce the stock of CO2 in the atmosphere from the current 430ppm to 350ppm to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. So not only does the current Australian government's proposed scheme fall short of the (now) conservative recommendations of both The Stern (and Garnaut) Reports, it does nothing to address the more recent suggestions that the current stock of CO2 be reduced. In short, the targets set virtually commit the world to dangerous climate change.

While there are uncertainties surrounding climate change and the potential impacts, these uncertainties should be treated as a risk that can be insured against. And given the relatively low cost of mitigation when compared to the potentially catastrophic costs of unabated climate change, surely a higher risk premium should be paid by current generations to secure our childrens future.

The CRPS currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. Australia must set a strong target with a well designed scheme that does its fair share and reflects our current and historical contribution to the problem.

Current economic problems must not be seen as an impediment to continuing with a strong position on climate change action. In contrast, let us use the opportunity to re-focus the Australian economy to take advantage of the new growth industries in renewable energies and sustainable goods and services and develop a competitive advantage for our nation.

Yours Sincerely,
Rebecca Sullivan

Dear Politicians,

For the sake of our children and the future generations please make the right choices for our environment, and do not be swayed by greed and profits, our future is in jeopardy!, and we need to make a stand, and lead the way in reducing our greenhouse emissions. Be the demonstration of something greater for the sake of all. Thank you and may God be with you all.

Daytura Kadens

Dear Greens & Independents

Please use your vote in the Senate to block the Government's pathetic 5% target for Greenhouse gas reductions and push for a more vigorous approach that is not subservient to the industrialist and coal lobbies.

Dr. Viraf Bhavnagri

I submit to the government that we need to take strong action to combat climate change. We should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). We should not encourage schemes that allow polluters to compensate for their pollution ... every industry, every business needs to maximise their energy efficiency and minimise their carbon footprint, schemes should be designed to encourage this, and make polluting economically unviable. If the general public see that the corporate world is being responsible about this, then they will be more prepared to make an effort in their private homes. The government should sponsor research and development that can lead to Australia becoming a world-leader in alternative energy sources, especially solar, and energy efficient technology.

Brenda Hall

Annangrove, NSW

The proposed targets are far short of what is becoming obvious is required. Every day there seems to be more news and research indicating that climate change will happen faster than originally predicted and this is a trend that is likely to continue.

Please aim for a solution that will actually mitigate the oncoming problems rather than one that will in the long run make no difference at all.

regards,
brian wallis...

We have to get serious about this - the current ice shelf collapse in Antarctica should be a reminder that things are worse than we first thought. We do not have the luxury of waiting and seeing.

Polluters have been feather-bedded for so long they see it as their right - it isn't. And it is time we told them.

Let's get real.

G. Phillips

Dear Senate Enquiry

My family have taken many steps to reduce our carbon emissions - solar hot water heating, energy efficient light bulbs, energy efficient appliances, insulating our home, using public transport and cycling. Everyone who can afford to do these things should be encouraged to do so, and people on low incomes should be subsidised. Our new carbon trading scheme should be designed to support rather than waste the efforts of individuals to reduce their emissions.

The carbon trading scheme should also have high targets to drive behaviour change and innovation in communities, business and government.

Yours faithfully

Natalie Ross
Marrickville

Dear Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy,

Australia is such a beautiful country we cannot let it be destroyed by pollution. What will future generations think of us?

The 5-15% target is not high enough, instead it should be 50% by 2020. Climate change is happening at an alarming rate and the environment needs us to think wisely about how we treat it.

There are new growth industries in renewable energy in which to focus the economy.

Please take the time to think about the importance of this issue and the severe effects climate change can cause.

Yours sincerely

Natasha Jackson

When I returned to Australia permanently from New Zealand at the beginning of 2008, I was delighted by the government's promise at Bali to introduce carbon targets which, the Prime Minister said, would be 'robust' and 'informed by the science'.

But the targets have been a disappointment. I have not heard one scientist applaud the 5-15% target; on the contrary, all the science I've read says that targets of that size commit Australia to carbon levels that, if replicated around the world, would make irreversible and very damaging climate change the most likely scenario. Indeed, each new scientific report suggests even deeper cuts will be needed to address changes which prove faster and more serious with each successive finding.

We know that the adverse impact of climate change is being felt most, and will continue to be felt most, by the poorest nations with the least ability to adapt. Australia's once-proud human rights record, which many of us hoped to see restored under Labor, will not return while we stick with carbon targets which effectively condemn many of the world's poorest to worsening drought and extreme weather and land loss due to sea level rise.

On a recent visit to Bavaria, where I spent some of my teen years, I was staggered to see the rustic farm houses I remembered now covered in solar panels. If Bavaria (where I once read a spring newspaper headline: "Unglaublich: Die Sonne Scheint Wieder in Bayern!" ("Unbelievable: The Sun Shines in Bavaria Again!")) can take serious steps towards renewable energy, surely so can we. And yet the CPRS as it stands does nothing to wean Australia off our coal addiction.

A serious carbon reduction target, part of a properly designed scheme with real incentives to move to alternative energy sources, would not only reduce Australia's contribution to climate change but also position us to benefit from the new industries associated with renewables.

A/Prof. Marion Maddox
Director
Centre for Research on Social Inclusion
Macquarie University

It is probably too late now to avoid major climate change tipping points; but the extent of this coming catastrophe can still be reduced by global action - phase out coal fired power stations now and learn to live without other greenhouse pollutants.

Let's aim to reduce greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Leigh Callinan

The results of mans mistreatment of our Earth & Enviroment are too numerous & critical to continue to avoid & just hope nothing "bad" will happen which directly affects our lives.

Please take these problem seriously & plan for safe- guarding our future - not just the corporate dollar.

An Everyman

I alternate between despair and anger regarding the government's climate change policy as set out in the CPRS. The policy as it stands is worse than useless in that it will barely make a dint in our pollution levels and in fact appears to reward the very industries responsible for the most pollution. How can the Government repeatedly ignore the advice of experts and do virtually nothing to improve the situation? This is a time for strong, imaginative and decisive action, to stand up to the big end of town and impose stricter limits. What is the point of repeating the mantra of 'jobs, jobs, jobs,' if by inaction the planet is destroyed. And why are the potential jobs that would be created if renewable energy options were pursued repeatedly ignored. The power of the Coal Lobby and others of its ilk is terrifying. Frankly I am sick and tired of 'us' the ordinary people being told to tighten our energy belts when the Government kow tows to a small section of the community and does nothing of any real consequence. How about leading the world...Today the broad band scheme was announced, a visionary policy, that may or may not work but it is exciting, bold, looking beyond the next election, why not take the same approach to Climate Change. I believe most people want more than the lily livered approach at present being taken.

Sallie Ramsay

Dear Senators,

It is imperative that REAL action be taken to reduce greenhouse emissions to give humanity a chance at a future. Unless we take this seriously my grandchildren will be in grave danger of joining in with the dinosaurs as fatalities of ice-age, brought on by disruption of ocean currents due to global warming. We can stop this by acting sensibly to reduce greenhouse emissions.

1. Transport emissions account for 50% of carbon emissions. You can legislate to reduce emissions radically. No-one needs a V8 or 4L guzzler for private use. Hybrid vehicles can be fast-tracked through development and production. Kia make a hybrid diesel truck, these should be prioritized as a matter of urgency. Bus fuels can also be improved upon radically.

2. Massive increase in public transport options, frequent bus services which continue through the evening, smaller buses to match demand, priority of traffic lanes to buses.

3. Incentives for shared-ride such as more T2 lanes, parking priority.

4. Increase fuel taxes to discourage private use of vehicles.

5. Reduce cost of public transport and improve efficiencies as a matter of urgency.

6. New building projects such as hospitals, shopping centres and schools should have some self-generated energy capacity such as wind turbines and solar panels to reduce demand on grid.

7. Industry should be encouraged to develop more energy efficient ways of producing their products. Research and development has been scarily undervalued by successive governments.

8. Economic programs do not inspire confidence: sound practical measures need to be taken NOW!

9. 5% reduction in emissions is nowhere near enough to secure a future for humanity. GET REAL PLEASE!

Karen Wall

The Commonwealth Government's pathetic commitment to a 5 - 15% target for reducing the nation's CO2 emissions over the next 10 years gives me more cause for alarm than all the dire commentary on the economy.

The emerging scientific findings suggest that previous modelling was conservative and you don't have to be a climatologist to see that our agriculture industry is in big trouble due to seemingly perpetual drought.

In the last 20 years I have witnessed the gradual change in the climate and the vegetation in the Huon Valley in Tasmania. Since no science has been brought to bear on the subject I can postulate that there are macro global climate changes due to carbon dioxide increases in the atmosphere coupled with the systematic removal of all the old growth forests on public and private land in the region (the Southern Forests).

Clearly the Government has been 'got at' by the Coal industry lobby and the CFMEU. You could almost pinpoint the day that even the talk went limp. But there's too much at stake here to allow an interested industry lobby not only stop Australia taking a lead role in reversing the human impact of carbon pollution, they hold Australia back from even taking a sane and ethical stance in the face of the consequences we are bringing on ourselves.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is currently symptomatic of the Government's complete cave in to the coal, woodchipping and transport industry lobbies - the polluters have no place in the modern world, like whalers and slavers in the past. They should receive fair compensation but not at the expense of the Australian community or the alternative industries that are struggling to establish.

Australian people are all trying to reduce their carbon footprint - even without a Government taking the lead. It's a big disappointment that the Government was happy to make positive noises about reducing CO2 emissions before the election in 2007: it was possibly the single most important issue in the mind of the Australian electorate and the Rudd government is trying to bury it.

It's too serious.

Yours sincerely
Suzy Manigian

In light of the new information stating that climate change is happening more quickly than anticipated.

It is now crucial that we have strong targets which send a message to the rest of the world that we are serious about solving the problem of climate change. It is a sobering thought to think that the Arctic summer sea ice could melt entirely within the next five years.

Janet Stacey

If there is one book the Senate Inquiry into the Government's climate policy should take note of its deliberations, it is Climate Code Red by David Spratt, (Scribe, 2008). The quantities of independent, scientifically validated research contained within it form a dire picture of a planet in crisis. It also looks at technological fixes and the means by which we can overcome political, corporate and social blocks that prevent us from trying to achieve a 'safe climate economy'. It contains some valuable and worthy ideas but they require a critical mass which, if the proposed Government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is anything to go by, we are some way off from achieving.

Anyone who has done even superficial research into climate change must appreciate how necessary it is for developed countries to commit to serious emission reductions. As a family living in suburban Sydney, we have installed solar hot water, a greywater recycling system, a rainwater tank, two vegetable patches and a chicken run for two chickens. But none of these personal environmental efforts mean two hoots if industry is able to increase their emissions under the Government's proposed cap (as they no doubt most assuredly will - see Guy Pearce's essay in the most recent edition of Black Inc's Quarterly Essay "Quarry Vision").

A 5-15% target is playing at the margins. I hope the Senate Inquiry will be able to exert some pressure on the Government to increase the cap to something much more meaningful.

Yours sincerely
Anna Le Masurier

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am very concerned that the 5-15% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions proposed by the government are completely inadequate and dangerous. The world needs strong action from all countries, and as a developed country with high per capita emissions it is vital for Australia to commit to much higher targets.

Any change is hard, but if we have strong leadership I believe we can make at least a 40% cut by 2020. The Australian people are crying out for leadership on this crucial issue. Let us not disappoint current and future generations by sticking with a weak target which will not solve the environmental problems and will not inspire other countries to do their bit.

Yours sincerely,

David Wanless.

Sometimes, politicians are the worst qualified people to make important decisions. That is especially the case with major problems, such as climate change, which require long-term solutions. The short-term election cycle can be a blinding distraction to the clear thinking needed.

With climate change we must be bold. We must be prepared to lose old jobs, to lose old industries, to lose old ways of doing business. Politicians must stop vote counting and start counting the cost of timidity.

The government's 5-15% target is timid, blinded thinking which will lead to catastrophic results. This is a government elected with a clear mandate for bold action on climate change, and instead it is pushing for half-measures. As one of the most-at-risk nations in the world, we should be leading the way on bold action and strong targets. Instead of providing such an example, we are divesting ourselves of our responsibilities and providing a disastrous model.

I strongly urge you to take much bolder action to reduce carbon emissions - a 50% reduction by 2020, as is being recommended by the scientific community, and a removal of the floor imposed by CPRS.

I urge you to act as if your term in office is 40 years. To think of long-term solutions, to think of your children's children. If we are to lose old jobs and old industries, focus on the new jobs and new industries which will be needed to provide environmental security down the years.

Thanks for your time,

Rose Vines

This government needs to take real action on climate change. 5% cut won't make a real difference, especially since everyone can see that there will be no real mechanism to encourage individuals to reduce their own emissions, and the grossest polluters will be compensated for continuing on their merry and irresponsible way. Every single report that comes from the scientists shows things to be much WORSE than predicted. This requirtes stronger action, not weaker.

Please, please, for the sake of my teenage children and their desendants, show that Australia is serious. There has not been one decision on climate change that amounts to anything from this government, =despite all the rhetoric. Please, show that this is about more than just winning the next election, and show that you have something like vision.

We need MUCH deeper cuts to greenhouse emissions from Australia, the world's greatest over-polluter. If we don;t show we're serious, who will, and why would they?

We need serious work to maximise power generation from renewable sources, not hiding behind misleading policy, which we can all see through."This should encourage", in Ferguson's mailouts, cuts no ice. Why only 20% renewable, by 2020, long after your government is history? That is woefully inadequate, and a feeble target for a country so over-endowed with solar exposure. It is truly incredible that this government is so bound to the interests of the coal industry lobby and the aluminium industry lobby. More than incredible, it is shameful, and verging on the corrupt.

In a time of serious recession, we should be seeking ways to break the mould, find new ways of doing things, and actually make change. So far all we see is staleness, fear, conformity with discredited ways of acting, principal amongst whch is the attitude to power generation.

We need gross feed-in tariffs to encourage massive uptake of domestic and commercial solar electricity generation. We need real investment, not \$50m for Geothermal Drilling Program. Not waffle about "key policy" that is deliberately not specific. Comparability with "other countries, including the European Union, the United States and the United Kingdom" (in what sense is the UK not part of the European Union? For what reason is Germany not singled out in the same way?).

I feel insulted by the responses I get from government on this issue. By selective reporting of funding allocations and reference to meaninglessly distant target, massively variable in scope (maybe 5%, maybe something more - it just depends), the only messgae that really comes acorss is that this government is not really prepared to take difficult decisions. It cowers in the corner, and hopes to be shown the way by someone else, bigger, more authoritative, and if those others refuse to show themselves, well, don't expect Australia to recognise an unquestionable need, to discharge its obligations to the FUTURE of the country - after all, you;re only the government.

Shoudl I be so cynical?

Action, please, ambitious, meaningful, binding targets, not the feeble pretence you put up.

Thank you.

.

Ever in hope
Tom Lumley

From being a leading exporter Australia is now having to import wheat. What will become of our food security when global warming really bites? We've already lost the Murray-Darling irrigation areas, maybe forever.

Cuts in greenhouse emissions through renewable energy production and greater energy efficiency can create jobs and help the economy revive. Tell the government to stop favouring the coal industry to the detriment of the rest of us. Install a carbon tax.

Make a 50% reduction by 2020 the target.

Regards
Jan Robbins

To the Members of the Senate

While I have not been able to come to any final conclusion regarding climate change (as the "evidence" presented by both sides of the discussion is far too unclear and open to manipulation), I believe what we are doing to our planet is not right. If we are worried about our existence to the point we are willing to fight other nations on the same planet to ensure our survival and that of our children, surely we should be just as concerned about ensuring the survival of the planet on which we live? This must surely be the ultimate priority of every man, woman and child, especially our representatives--the government (at all levels).

This means, first and foremost, the reduction of greenhouse pollution, which needs to start with the large polluters, but also needs to extend to the "unseen" polluters producing the very food we need in order to exist, and those supporting them (mainly, the big two supermarket chains).

Please look at this as another of your avenues. Let's face it, the more people buying sustainably grown, local food or growing some if it in their back yard or in community gardens, the quicker we will see reductions in greenhouse gasses (from exhaust gasses of the vehicles transporting the food, and the manufacture of the factories to make those vehicles, through to the energy required to store unseasonal produce to make it available in the off season or to places that normally would not be able to access it, etc.).

Support the push for ensuring the survival of yourself in the long term--this will encompass not just your needs (or those you see as needs that are more aptly defined as comforts and conveniences) and comforts of the moment, but those of the people you need to be alive and healthy in order to provide them. As a representative of the Australian population, it is your duty to ensure the same for every person in Australia. Ultimately, this means trying to ensure the long-term sustainability of our nation.

This would mean many uncomfortable changes for the better. Please have the guts to give this subject this attention it deserves. This may mean a decline in popularity for the short term, but would result in your survival, as both a human being, an Australian and finally, as a paid representative of the Australian people.

Take heed, and act... for the future of Australians and the Earth we live upon.

Kind regards,
Sandra Ogata

To the Senate,

As an Australian citizen, I am very concerned 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).

We need stronger action on all areas of climate change, including the CPRS. Citizens are prepared to employ lifestyle changes and i do not understand why industry continues to get away with such large amounts of pollution for production of materials, many of which, alternatives are possible. Monetary assistance assigned to this area of the national budget could surely be diverted to assist such changes in industry in a practical way rather than in the politically driven way currently being proposed.

Please be true representatives of the people whom voted you in on these issues. We are all counting on you to make the decisions necessary to provide a prosperous future for our children. Prosperous in the LONG TERM, not for short term gain on any accounts.

Yours Sincerely,

Mardi Beaumont

Dear Prime Minister Rudd,

The Labour Government's present carbon emissions target of 5-15% is not adequate if we are to avoid serious climate change in the near future. Because the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment, we are all faced with the very real danger that the scheme will in fact do more, not less harm to the environment. Setting a strong target of 50% reduction of greenhouse gases by 2020 (on 1990 levels) will state to the world that Australia is willing to seriously embrace the need to prevent climate change and will also encourage both Australia and the world to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. At the moment, 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. A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much

more quickly than previously thought. To take just one example, the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. 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%. Indeed, their actions will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap. On behalf of concerned Australians, I urge you to take stronger action on climate change now, for the well-being not only of Australia but all of the world.

Yours sincerely

Dr Mark Caldicott.

Dear Rudd Labor Government,

Penny Wong and other members of your team seem to take every opportunity to tell Australians that they need to do everything to address climate change. Its as if you understand how much of a threat it is, as with a deep-knowing conviction and you feel you have to have everyone understand that we have to do some seriously and now.

Yet the policy you are trying to sell doesn't convince anyone. Why don't you become really serious and create a seriously real climate change policy.

Yours respectfully,

Brooke

I propose that you make a real difference to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution of 50% by 2020 at the least.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme needs to be improved with polluters penalised and campaigns advertising the offenders to make the community and government equal in the environment partnership. Indigenous communities should be leaders in educating the rest of Australia how to co-exist without damage to the environment.

Please act now! There is no time to waste.

Regards
Margie Roe

It is time for EVERYONE to shoulder the burden of greenhouse gas reduction. Our greenhouse gas reduction target must be at least 50% -- TIME IS RUNNING OUT!!! We should not be subsidizing big industry to keep polluting - we should be investing in alternative public transport infrastructure and green industries that will not only produce less carbon emissions, but will also provide green jobs for the future - not to mention a high degree of expertise in green industries that would be salable overseas.

Lynda Hutchinson

Dear Sirt/Madam,

I'm concerned that the Government is condemning us to a rapid change in climate. I have seen the latest scientific evidence and IPCC report summary that indicates that climate change is occurring as fast, if not faster than predicted.

A 5 to 15% reduction is weak and likely to be ineffective. There is no doubt that a larger commitment, in the order of 40-50% will change our economy, and require significant restructuring of industry, business and legislation.

Positioning ourselves for a low-carbon economy is best approach for our nation.

Please reconsider and vote for a long-term 40-50 % reduction,

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Del Marco

7th April 2009

The IPCC has gathered an enormous quantity of data on climate change and recommends that large cuts in CO2 emissions are required to reduce the likelihood and degree of dangerous climate change, which jeopardises human food supplies, water supplies, threatens to submerge coastal areas and greatly increases threats from bushfires and extreme weather occurrences.
(IPCC, 2007, www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr.pdf)

The Federal government's proposed cut of 5-15% are unacceptably low. It is not sufficient to avoid dangerous climate change. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement. Our targets must be swiftly improved to at least a 30% reduction on 1990 levels (of greenhouse gas emissions), before the December 2009 conference on climate change.

Other governments such as Germany's have found economic benefits in taking on strong emission reduction policies. They base their policies not only on the need to avoid dangerous climate change but on the the evidence that strong investment by government in windfarms, solar and other non-poluting sources of electricity as well as radical improvements to public transport can make a higher targets for greenhouse gas reduction acheivable as well as being economically sound. These policies are sound investments generating new green jobs and stronger export industries.

yours

Daniel D.

Daniel Diesendorf

Dear Prime Minister Rudd

Overwhelming evidence points to the next decade as our last chance to stop climate change from making our world a more and more uncomfortable place to live.

And it's not just me I'm worried about. I'm beginning to wonder if I should have children at all - I'm not sure if the world I would leave my children is a fit place to grow up in.

Australia should be leading the way in climate change, not flagging with this pathetic 5% target. Rather, set a 50% reduction target.

Then we'll believe that you actually care about this.

Regards
Bron Willis

As a farmer I am noticing how climate change is affecting my environment and ask that you increase the target to avoid serious (and possibly irreversible) damage to our planet. The target should be at least 50%.

sincerely,
Christine Ross

Our efforts as a united country are not strong enough towards climate change. The Australian people and National Governments 5-15% target is not high enough to have an impact. By increasing the target to a minimum of 50% we increase the exposure on how important this issue is nationally and stamp out any possible up heaves.

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.

Kind regards,

Andrew Milne

As I look around I see people going about 'business as usual'. We are 'on the Titanic heading for an iceberg' -is that business as usual? Australians need leadership. Intelligent people are remaining ignorant, acting stupid, unconscious of (1) the complex ramifications of increased water levels in the Pacific on Australia and her neighbours, (2) impacts on climate of rampant LAND CLEARING in Tasmania/Australia (irresponsibly left out of Regional Forest Agreement sustainability criteria), or (3) the effects of our excessive consumption of water, non-renewable fuels, and food types (red meat) which are degrading the environment and contributing directly to climate change. Please show the leadership needed to avert this local/global catastrophe.

sincerely

Heather Chaplin

I can not believe that the Government scheme will make impotent any efforts by the community to reduce greenhouse gasses. A huge percentage of the community want to contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. People want to reduce their energy use, they are putting solar panels and solar hot water produces on their roof but this Government is rewarding the polluters with free permits or simply diverting public efforts to enable the big polluters to continue to pollute.

The Government gives huge subsidies to the coal industry and token support to the renewable energy industries. Meanwhile the expertise, developed in Australia, continues to be drained overseas.

Support for the coal industry is often based on the need to secure jobs. If the planet is unlivable no one will have a job in the normal sense. However, a case study. Lloyd(?) Energy Storage, CEO Steve Hollis, has developed a graphite block storage for solar energy, giving 24 hour energy to drive electricity turbines. They are based in Cooma, regional NSW. They employ about 25 people and use other small manufactures in Moruya and Queanbeyan. They are setting up commercial plants and have interest from overseas. They create regional jobs and inovative technology. They get no help from the Government as far as I know. The coal industry gets a \$9billion subsidy annually.

Pyramid power in Pambula, Bega Shire, emplys 26 people and plan to put on 10 more as the region is concerned about global warming and there is a huge desire to use photovoltaic cells on houses to meet household energy use. The Govt. helps with an \$8000 rebate but caps it at \$100000 family income. This growth in jobs and greenhouse reduction could be magnified in regional Australia if the Government supported a gross feed-in-tariff.

The Labour Party with the Liberals subsidise research in to "clean" coal. This is where their focus is. IF it worked 20 or more years are needed to get it working. By then we will be well and truly up the creek. If it does not work we are dead. We have the technology today to solve the problems of greenhouse gasses and jobs.

Do something constructive for our and the Planet's sake!!

Don Dornan

How much longer can we as a nation bury our heads in the sand and deny the impacts and severity of climate change? We are a key contributor of emissions on a global scale, yet it is not us Australia at present but developing countries that will bear the largest impacts of climate change. I feel as an Australian that we have always prided ourselves on a sense of 'playing fair'. Yet our own weak target is undermining the efforts to form a crucial and fair agreement at the UN Climate Conference in Copenhagen.

We can and should be harnessing all the natural renewable energy sources we have at our doorsteps, solar, wind and tidal energies. We could build an economy through harnessing these technologies and lead the world in this field.

I am sick and tired of the best interests of the nation being decided beyond my control and feeling powerless to do anything to stop decisions that will ultimately affect us people of this planet. I fundamentally believe that we can all make a difference. I would like a detailed response stating how this 5% reduction has been decided upon and a detailed summary of actions and measures that the government will use to tackle climate change.

Warm regards
Helen McAuley

I don't think I have got it wrong on the climate change seriousness. I feel you are grossly underestimating the peril we are facing I urge you to reconsider the 5-15% moves you are intending to make to something more like 30-40%. Damn any other consequences we will still need to breathe in 10 years time! Yours seriously Len Evans

I have two main problems with the Government's climate policy:

1. The targets are too weak! We need to see a targetted reduction of 50% by 2020 to avoid dangerous climate change. The risks are too big. We need to manage the climate change risk properly and that means a meaningful pollution reduction target.

2. I don't want you giving my money to the big polluters! The proposed CPRS seems badly flawed. We should not be giving these big polluters handouts. They must hold their own in the new marketplace. If they need compensation then it should be treated as an investment by the government, giving the government a say in how they are run and an opportunity to force them to improve their environmental bottom line.

Please be bold on this! Regards,

Rishi Viner.

I believe that the current targets as proposed by the current federal government are too small. Notwithstanding the current financial "crisis" we can afford to set bigger targets and achieve them. Far from exacerbating the financial crisis, the new technologies will lead us into renewed financial health.

Peter Massey

Dear Representatives,

I ask you to consider a bold and imaginative response to the risks that climate change poses to Australia and the planet. Make Australia a leader in promoting change and inspiring initiative. Let's have some radical change in the order of a 50% real reduction in Australia's carbon footprint by 2020 based on 1990 levels.

Best regards,
Derek Austin

As the ice shelves off Antarctica disintegrate, and we have had unprecedented heat waves in southern Australia and low rainfall in our Murray/Darling "food bowl", the proposed Carbon reduction scheme for Australia offered by the federal government is totally inadequate. Australia is one of the countries which science says will be hardest hit by climate change. We need to commit to at least 25% reduction in carbon emissions, and move away from a coal powered economy. Big polluters should not be shielded from making reductions in carbon emissions. The currently proposed scheme mocks the efforts of individuals and households to reduce carbon emissions - their efforts will be wasted, as their reductions will essentially be "given away" to big polluters.

Australia needs to look to best practice such as in Germany, and foster its alternative energy industries by funding research into creating energy from hot rocks, tidal, solar and wind. We should be leaders in this field, not years behind and seeing our best researchers in these areas go overseas. There needs to be a reduction in subsidies to polluting industries such as coal, and a concerted effort to phase out dependence on coal.

The Carbon Reduction scheme needs to be rethought. People need to have a voice in this, not just big polluting corporations.

Regards
C. Kemp

I urge the Australian federal government to take stronger action to avoid dangerous climate change. I ask that priority be given to the community and the environment rather than accommodating the polluters. As an Australian citizen I ask the government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by the year 2020 on 1990 levels

Shirley Hughes

To all

We must make strong and determined efforts to reduce our green house gases. We cannot pretend any longer that we have any time left. There is a frightening amount of data already to hand that shows we are facing an enormous problem. Please do all you can to act to increase awareness of the problem.

Yours sincerely

Rosalind Gillespie

Dear Mr Rudd,

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

If Australia does not improve its targets, we will undermine efforts to form crucial international agreement which must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Yours faithfully,

Marion Gray

The current legislation in its treatment of carbon credits is a positive disincentive to individual saving of carbon emissions. The Labour Government promised us you would do better than this. Put our unemployed to work on climate change projects like placing solar panels on homes, installing tanks, etc.

Angela Nordlinger

I work for an "Emissions Intensive Trade Exposed Industry" and am in the middle of the process of applying for 'free' permits. Some observations:

- 1) The current system is absurdly complex and tries too hard to measure every single last emission - but then leaves out agriculture.
- 2) The current system is trying very hard to map energy "production & consumption" across the economy. It may be an interesting academic exercise, but it's damned expensive to have business generate the data for. Oh, and by the way, energy is conserved in all systems so the whole thing becomes a fantastic muddle. Why am I paying taxes for this?
- 3) Carbon trading is heavily lobbied for by people who want to make money, not reduce carbon. The faint hope we have is that the system we adopt might at least for the first couple of years have a fixed permit price - and then we never adopt permit trading.

Business needs certainty, even if permit prices need to go up exponentially to achieve the cuts we're likely to need to save some of civilisation. Permit trading is just going to encourage speculators, financial operators and downright crooks to game the system. GFC.

4) International trading in permits is to be avoided at all costs. All that will happen is that a person in a far away country will offer to sell you permits in exchange for not logging a large piece of land. If you check later and find that the land has been logged (presumably to grow palm oil for biofuels so as to get yet more permits) then it was all a misunderstanding, they never owned the land in the first place, you must be looking for my brother etc. If the parties involved in a trade both have incentives to 'game' the system at the expense of others who have no effective control over the trade, then you will have a dodgy system. If international justice can't cope with war criminals or sea pirates, how the blazes will it ever deal with petty financial theft?

5) It's not complex to reduce carbon. It is politically hard, but dramatic change is coming anyway, so let's have the courage to choose the kind of change we want.

Most of our carbon comes from burning coal, so slap an initially low but exponentially increasing excise on coal (at point of consumption) and hydrocarbon (at current excise point). That will provide certainty for people to invest in solar / wind / geothermal / natural gas power generation (either central or local) and also to fund energy conservation efforts. The incentives will be clear and transparent to all. Keep It Simple Stupid.

(What to do with the excise revenue? Reduce payroll tax. We should tax sinning, not doing good.)

We need to design a system that encourages investment in all the 'green' technologies so we can lead export of the technologies etc and boost our local jobs. Yes we need to manage the pace of change, but we need to start yesterday.

If you compare the countries in Europe who've taxed carbon (Sweden) with those who have trading (UK), it's clear that a carbon tax is simple, effective and works. Carbon trading has not demonstrably worked.

Good luck. Frustratedly yours,

John Godfrey
MIEAust

I am ashamed, that Australia is only looking for a 5 to 15% reduction of greenhouse pollution: A country with all the sunshine of the world, with enough space for solar panels to supply the base electricity need of all cities, with enough wind to supply electricity for smaller communities and with a population which knows how climate change can impact their lives.

Mr. Rudd, it is one thing to stand around the G20 Conference and make suggestions, but you also have to face the UN Conference in Copenhagen and make intelligent suggestions, a bit more than saying: Sorry, we can't do more... . We should aim to get to 50 % reduction by 2020 and we should have the laws to do that.

Angelika Lange

Dear inquiry members,

If you are not deeply worried about CLIMATE CHANGE and are not starting to panic round about now - then there is something deeply wrong and you shouldn't be involved in Climate Change policy making!

For everyone's sake it is time to get serious about taking the decisions that scientists and the voting public want to see taken. This means get out of bed with the Coal and Oil industry - they are yesterdays industries and start having a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that actually forces the big polluters to stop increasing pollution.

Ian Colley

Please note that your 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).

Further 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 take action NOW to protect our future and that of my 12 year old!

Thank you

Melissa Halliday

Global carbon dioxide levels are at 387ppm and need to be immediately reduced to 350ppm. At no time in all of human history have such high levels existed. The balance of the carbon and water cycles are in a precarious position and Australia is one country most at risk from a breakdown in these cycles due to our climate and ecosystems.

Globally, we need between 80-100% of GHG emissions reduced ASAP. By 2020 or 2050 it may be too late, as feedback loops will have already generated a runaway condition which no target will be able to rectify.

Instead these inquiries are like Nero fiddling while Rome burns. We cannot afford to argue any more, which is why committing to a global CO2 level of 350ppm is so critical.

Get the fossil fuel industry out of these negotiations, and as the video says "wake up, freak out and then get a grip".

The Australian Governments response is pitifully inadequate. It is undermining international impetus and all of our futures.

Regards

Melissa Hellwig

Ex-coal mining industry employee and mother of kids who want kids of their own.

I have a BSc in Environmental Sciences: I know what I'm talking about. As a politician I don't expect you to fully understand how the environment works. What I do expect is that you implement sound policies based on good scientific knowledge and recommendations. I also expect you to have the valour to make strong, urgent and important decisions for the future of Australia.

This is one of those times, one of those decisions. Five percent is inadequate. It would be inadequate as a response to the recommendations that were based on old information. The current information calls for far far more urgent and far stronger targets. We - the scientifically trained, erred on the side of caution in the statement about the threat. It is far more immediate than initially thought.

To fail in your duty to deliver what the country - and the entire world - needs, is to condemn yourself to being just another, short-sighted uninspired and inconsequential little person, no less, but no more than the rest of the people of this country. But by your lack of strength in this crisis, you threaten to condemn all.

Stand up.

Deliver strong, workable and fair measures Urgently.

Regards,

Rosalind Edgar BSc.(AES)

Dear Representatives

Please consider the future of 'our' nation's bequest to the coming generations' experience of 'our' planet via dedication to effective attention to policy change on climate change & all that that entails.

Your role enables you (on our behalf) to make a difference for us all & those not yet born, for whom we must take care of 'our' planet.

With appreciation for your ongoing hard & thoughtful work

c gally mckenzie

Dear Sir/Madam,

I believe that the current structure of the Caron Pollution Reduction Scheme discourages individual carbon reduction action by removing individual results from the burden of industry.

Furthermore, I believe that the target of 5-15% is manifestly too low in the face of scientific findings showing that a 50% reduction on 1990 levels is required.

As one of the greatest per-capita emitters in the world, and one of the richest per-capita nations in the worlds, if we are not in a position to make serious long term reductions of a higher order than we cannot expect other countries to.

Yours Faithfully

Chris Fulton

We need to stop fooling ourselves about so called "Clean Coal" and concentrate on Solar or Wind power. This could also create more jobs and better technology being developed. There are so many public buildings in each town/city with rooves that face north-Why can't we fill them with enough Solar panels to power the whole town.

If we let business off paying for greenhouse gasses why can't they put money into solar hotwater or power.The CPRS compensates the polluters but the Community and the Environment pay.

Have we any thought for the our great grand children with this 5-15% target ? Most of the plants and animals will be killed off-they will have to live on a Moonscape!!

We are selling ourselves and our jobs overseas! Why don't we give the poor countries fair wages and help them to keep their forests and reduce our emissions and save the small Islands that are being flooded out ?

Please change now before it is too late !

Yours sincerely,
Bernadine Kelly

It is time we grow up. We need to do what it takes to reduce the devastating reality that we are heading into.

It is not a matter of putting industry in a "life support system" to keep it alive. We need to ensure that the people have a chance of staying alive. We must act now, not tomorrow. It will hurt, the population will need to adapt to a different life style and there will always be those that deny any need but we must act now. There is no more time to waste.

The stakes are way too high to simply 'stick the head in the sand' and pretend this huge problem is not there.

The government MUST act decisively now in every possible way to do what is morally right. If we, Australians, have to set the way and the example, so be it. To deny the need to do what it takes because "others" dont seem to take it seriously enough is immature, irresponsible and outright criminal.

I am disgusted at the government weak leadership, surrender to huge vested interests that are the main cause to the problem, truck loads of rhetoric and political 'bull', delaying tactics and generally an unethical self-destructing attitude.

We all know what we need to do. Lets get on with it. Working together we can achieve unbelievable things. No more 'band-aid' work, lets do ALL we can with courage.

Regards,
Miguel Pez

Dear Senators

The Rudd government was elected with a clear mandate to take serious action on climate change and the environment. All evidence indicates it was the most important major issue for the electorate after removal of WorkChoices.

The Government's climate policy is a travesty of this mandate. Their 5-15% carbon target is weak, and the measures they propose to take are embarassingly ineffective.

The majority of credible scientists everywhere all say climate change is escalating. From droughts to melting icecaps to cyclones to bushfires, we're all seeing the effects.

Let's pay attention to what the climate change scientists say and invest properly in our future. We need a proper carbon reduction scheme, not the flimsy one designed by the government to let the current fossil fuel industries off the hook. We need proper investment in alternative energy sources. We need incentives for households and businesses to get serious about reducing their impact on the environment.

If the Senate acts firmly and clearly on this issue, we may yet save some of our future. We have to radically change our lifestyle at some point and it will be cheaper and have more positive impact to start now.

What's more, if we invest in a green economy now, it won't cost nearly as much as the critics say, and in fact it will be good for the economy as it will point us where we need to go in the medium and long term anyway.

We're beyond the point of politics as usual on this issue. If Rudd and Wong can't stand up to the fossil fuel lobby, then please ensure the Senate does. Please look beyond the petty Liberal/ALP point scoring we've seen for the past 18 months - yes, we've noticed and we're sick of it - and act for the good of the country.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Weiss

Increasingly the scientific consensus is pointing to the hastening arrival of dangerous climate change. Please commit to a serious reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution, put community and environmental considerations ahead of compensation for the heavy polluters and act quickly as we are fast running out of time.

Donald Barnes

To those who govern;

It is imperative that the Governments carbon reduction scheme be radically changed. We in the community, the people who put you in power, actually WANT to help. How can a carbon reduction scheme be designed that doesn't actually allow the community to help at all? How can you tell me that if I do my part in reducing my own carbon footprint it does nothing more than letting the big polluters increase their emissions?

Take a day out of Canberra, you are surrounded by pollies, public servants, and power hungry wankers etc etc. Go to your electorate, ask the people. We want our actions to count.

This is undoubtedly the biggest issue of our time. Its a no-brainer!

DESIGN A SCHEME THAT WILL ACTUALLY MAKE A DIFFERENCE!

GET YOUR ACT TOGETHER!

Tim Jenkins

The climate crisis is much more dangerous to the globe than the current financial crisis.

.... Bring back the solar pannel scheme to all

.....Nuclear power stations in all major coastal cities (dump the waste off the continental shelf in CSIRO's simrock)

.....Keep cars out of cities but with fast urban transit to the cities and car parks atthe stations for commuters

Dennis

I am very disappointed in the Government's actions to date on climate change. The 5% target on greenhouse gas emissions is woefully inadequate. Australia should be leading the world in the use of solar power, but instead it is developing technologies which are being used elsewhere!

Coal fired power should not be subsidised - polluters should pay directly and thus be motivated to diversify their energy generating capabilities into renewable sources.

The Government is getting sucked in by big polluters and large corporations and members of the general public who try to do the right thing for the environment are subsidising the polluters who are fast killing off the planet.

The Carbon REduction Scheme as proposed needs to be radically reviewed.

Lenore Jansen

Mr Rudd,

What happened?

You came in in such a blaze of light and hope. We voted for you in the belief that you were actually going to make a difference, a measurable proper difference in this whole climate crisis. And we had such hopes that you were going to take a strong lead internationally.

You seem to have squibbed it. And for why? Who got to you?

Yes we need China and India on board, but that hasn't stoppped Europe. Yes we need the USA on board, and yes we're small in the face of those three countries.

But unless this mouse roars, how can we possibly expect other countries to take the necessary steps? Someone has to take the lead.

We do not have to be at the mercy of the coal industry: there are workable, sound, renewable alternatives. But these will only be developed with resolve, and a clear eye on the goal not the obstacles.

How many Antarctic ice bridge collapses do you need? How many extinctions? How much pollution?

Please, reconsider this unacceptable target, and reset it upwards so that we can all get on with our lives under a properly designed plan.

Thank you
N Dixon

I was very disappointed to hear of Kevin Rudd's low target in reducing greenhouse emission, a measly 5%. This will really make very little difference, given that there is increasing scientific evidence that climate change is occurring even more quickly than previously thought. These weak targets undermine the global effort for international agreement. The current scheme ensures polluters benefit and the community suffers. Any reduction an individual makes will have no impact on the country's reduction. This disempowers and negates Australian citizens who care deeply for their environment.

Yours sincerely

Karen Peradon-Alaga

please make radical changes to reduce climate change! it seems that making a 15 % cut is not going to be effective enough, so therefore i would request for more stringent regulations to be put into place. We must decide on these before the next Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen. The CPRS needs to be redesigned so as not to undermine the efforts of the community and the environment. More stringent rules need to be put in place for industry to cap their emissions.

please encourage the government and the prime minister to take a forceful stand on reducing greenhouse pollution by as much as 50% by 2020.

thank you for taking time to read this,

Yours sincerely,

Ineke de Graaf

Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% (on 1990 levels). I voted for Labor on this issue alone. I keep hearing about polar caps melting faster than anyone predicted and I am really frightened for my children's future - aren't you for yours?!

Australia must increase it's target before the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen to encourage other countries to have higher targets. Setting a strong target with a well-designed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (which our isn't) 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. This is the smart way to go, or we will be left behind in this technology. I don't want to just make room for industry to pollute more, I want everyone in Australia to pollute less.

I look forward to your positive and forward thinking action on this.

Thank you.

Samantha Glasgow

To whom it may concern:

I am bitterly disappointed with the lack of leadership and vision shown by the Government in terms of establishing effective climate policy.

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

Slow and ineffective action this year means we will all pay huge costs in years to come. It is imperative that we have a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that internalises the costs associated with industrial pollution and that motivates companies to seek out, and implement, truly environment-friendly technologies.

Sincerely
M. Bradley

The scientific data shows that climatic changes are accelerating at a greater rate than was predicted in 1990, yet the Prime Minister is proposing a scheme which would have been inadequate even in that situation. If Australia is to survive we need a much stronger response than the one currently proposed, and if we are to lead those governments who are sceptical to take action then we need to do considerably better than that. A 50% reduction in greenhouse gasses in the next ten years would be adequate, and no over reaction. The current, badly designed schemes are totally inadequate. For the sake of our children, and grandchildren, make a realistic decision.

G.Spencer

Dear Sir/Madam

The current emission target cuts of 5 to 15 % are far too weak. The price of not acting more strongly now will increase our risk significantly of environmental and economic problems in the future. This is not a legacy I want to leave for our children.

The CPRS as it stands does not put enough onus on the big polluting companies. I realise it is not easy to make strong targets which negatively effect the profits of big companies but they need to be made accountable for the contribution they make to carbon dioxide emissions.

There is no doubt that stronger action on climate change will drive more investment into renewable energy. This in turn will create more jobs and not destroy jobs as the big emitters claim.

Best to take this strong action now than take a huge risk with the worlds climate.

Again Irealise it is not easy BUT the alternative could be disastrous. Even though we are a small country we need to take a lead role in the fight against climate change.

Yours Sincerely

Kent Heard

In Western Australia the Department of Environment and Conservation run the Western Shield . A wild life protection programme that aerial baits 3.8 million hectares of National Parks and wilderness four times a year.1080 is in dried meat baits that target all carnivorous animals ,Dingoes, foxes, cats wild dogs.

Anything that eats it will die a horrible inhumane death.

When you kill most of the predators in your environment you create massive imbalances by allowing herbivores to breed into plague proportions ,thus defoliating large areas and adding to the salinity problems.

I believe defoliation is one of the quickest ways to add to greenhouse effect.

Frank Seymour

Dear Kevin,

On Friday last week, you sent my grandparents, Roger and Fay Norton a letter wishing them well for their 60th wedding anniversary. They have seen a lot in their time, war, atomic bombs, wall st crash, they are also parents, grandparents and now great grandparents.

Global warming is a serious issue, lead the charge for the future, please.

Sincerely,

Joshua Parry

To those who make our decisions

I am a citizen of the beautiful country of Australia. I value this land very much and recognize its unique character. However, I am deeply concerned about the state that it will be in within the next decade. If today our water supplies are lower than ever, the land suitable for agriculture is diminishing, temperatures are rising, wildlife species are dying; where will we be in ten years time?

This concern drives me to make sustainable choices in the way I live. I, like thousands of other Australians, do what I can to minimize my impact on the environment. I have control over my choices but I do not have power to influence the decisions that industry makes regarding sustainability. This worries me. I observe how irresponsible industries can be with regarding their actions towards climate change. But what can I do about this?

The answer is, ask you to do something about it. Please act to increase Australia's omissions reduction target and to create responsible schemes to reduces industry energy usage. You have been elected to act on the behalf of all Australians, so please let our voices and actions guide your decisions and policies.

Thank you
Jonathan Wouters

I must urge the current government to rethink its suggested targets for carbon emissions or greenhouse pollutants.

Australia is now in a prime position to step up and declare its emphatic support of action against climate change. We have much to make up in the eyes of the world for stalling on the Kyoto agreement.

The structuring of this proposal allows some polluters to pollute more and gives no incentive for others to gain credit for reducing further.

We must right now be more accountable for the energy we consume and the pollutants we emit.

Its not only reflected in our warming atmosphere, but the health of our people, the quality of our air and water and the health of our fellow earth inhabitants.

While Australia's current economic downturn must in some part follow the general global climate, it is my belief the spending downturn is a definite indication of the public's general willingness and activity in pulling back and consuming less. We cannot afford to let industry continue to push what we should consume and disregard in what way it supplied to us. Australia is willing to use less and take advantage of alternatives, but we are aware it is industry that is the biggest energy user. We demand tougher restrictions on the worst polluters and more incentives for others to use less.

While we cannot be certain we have not left it too late, we can always be certain we make the best choice in working against drastic climate change. With one of the worlds driest continents, and a high value in retaining our beautiful environment we stand to gain much in protecting the atmosphere. I await eagerly your reconsideration.

Jai Larkman

As we hear this week of major ice shelves breaking up in the antarctic and arctic regions, it is imperative that the Australian Government increase its greenhouse gas reduction target to 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels). Also, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Government appears to over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. It is incredible that despite the urgency of acting swiftly on climate change, the Government is about to pour billions of dollars into the development of high speed internet infrastructure ...this money should be used instead for the immediate development of carbon neutral industries and technologies, particularly in the transport and energy sectors. Please act nowPleae listen to the science.

Regards Peter Jensen

To the Secretary, Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

Please take more effective action on climate change. The general public wants more action by the Government and less Carbon Pollution.

5%-15% reduction of green house pollution by 2020 is paltry and we need to adopt a more challenging target which sets an example for the rest of the world to follow. Strong action on climate change will create new jobs and increase investment into renewable energy.

Please change the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme to something more meaningful so that it will give future generations a prosperous future and they will have the necessary power to be able to tackle Climate Change head on.

Yours Sincerely,

Anne Newland-Tugwell

It is increasingly clear that we need to re-engineer our economy to achieve a net carbon output of zero asap. Virtually all the economic stimulus monies must be allocated to achieve this purpose through win-win initiatives like manufacturing biochar plants for widespread conversion of waste matter to productive biochar or agrichar.

We need your leadership to challenge our addiction to carbon and our inability to care about the world we are leaving our grandchildren. Please end the pretense that we can achieve sufficient reductions without real change and significant sacrifice.

Kind regards

Rod Mitchell

Dear Inquiry

This is not a normal policy question you are dealing with -one that can be dealt with by compromise and muddling through.

This is the most serious issue we face. Think of Australia at times of war - and then it's more serious than that.

We have to be bold, we have to come together and we have to do it now. How will we explain our actions to our grandchildren - we knew better but it was too hard?

Thanks very much and good luck with your work.

Nick Menzies

To the Government of Australia,

Climate Change is grave challenge for us all to face. If we do nothing, it will fundamentally change the structure of society, the economy and our environment. Scientists now agree that we need to reduce carbon emissions by 80% by the year 2050 or face serious to catastrophic climate change.

It is in this context that I urge you, the caretakers of Australia's people, economy, society and environment to make the largest concerted effort possible to be under this target. Whether it be investing in solar power, providing greater research grants for new or more efficient technology, or simply passing a law that all new buildings must have solar panel if they have exposure to the sun for more than 50% of a clear day, there's so many ways the Government can lead us into the 21st century economy.

However, if we maintain these small emission targets, it is unlikely that much will change. What's more, according to the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme as written, any more reduction in emissions than the maximum requirement will not be allowed.

This simply is lunacy. It is tantamount to saying that even if we could do more to stop massive social, economic and environmental upheaval, we should not.

Please remove the floor below which emissions cannot fall, as the socially optimal outcome is to have no carbon emissions at all and to have a new economy based around sustainable business and power production.

You should have confidence that the ingenuity of Australian businesses will create ways to reduce emissions further than is currently thought possible, and working alongside the Australian public, they together will collectively and individually reduce carbon emissions and the risk of catastrophic climate change - if you let them do it.

So please increase the target for the cut in carbon emissions required, and more importantly, please remove the floor below which emissions cannot fall.

Thank you on behalf of the youth of Australia,

Nick (19 years old)

Dear Members

It is crucial that carbon reduction targets are based on the urgency of the effect on the environment, and not on the convenience of the major polluters. Our economy has to change to become one based on sustainable practices and energy sources. The sooner we do this, the more likely it is we can take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. In the past we have lost innovations to overseas ownership, due to the lack of support in Australia, such as in the case of the Evacuated Tube solar hot water systems, which are 95%+ effective converting the sun's energy to hot water. It is so effective that even when the temperature is well below 0 degrees in on an overcast day, such a system can still heat the water to over 30 degrees, and has been doing so in such circumstances in Winter for more than ten years now in European cities such as Berlin.

The technology was first developed at Sydney University about 15 years ago. There was so little government or corporate interest in it here, it was only further developed by other countries, and is now fully patented and owned by them.

Please let's have some vision and urgency about setting targets and setting up a Carbon Reduction Scheme that will be effective in changing our energy sources, enable individual and corporate efforts at reduction to count for themselves, be a support to setting crucially effective international agreements, and significantly reduce Australia's harm to the environment. The Arctic ice is now melting at a pace no-one was expecting a few years ago, and the time for political weaselling and fudging is already long past.

We need to set targets to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

I want my children to inherit a world worth living in.

Yours sincerely

Tamsin Kelly

In view of the fact that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously expected (eg Arctic sea ice), I believe Australia needs to commit to a much larger reduction of greenhouse pollution than the target now recommended. Australia's weak target should be improved before the UN conference in Copenhagen. Setting a strong target with a well defined carbon pollution reduction scheme will ensure that Australia does its fair share, and will help our economy take advantage of new growth industries in this area of renewable energy.

Yours sincerely,
Rodger Bassham

The governments slow response to climate change is a huge disappointment. The majority of scientists have no doubt that the earth is undergoing profound change that is most likely caused by the developing nations. Leadership is required to prevent possible catastrophic results and as a member of the Labour party for 28 years I call upon the Rudd government to take immediate action.

Sue Atkinson
Broome

Seriously Guys,

If we are to leaders, then we need to make the hard calls and actually lead on this issue. Its not enough to say we'll make a little start and see who else joins in, then maybe do more. The CPRS as it stands locks targets for 5 years ahead, to give industry sufficient lead time to adjust. That means we will not be able to join in the rest of the world for 5 years after they set higher targets, Australia will look like a bunch of non caring fools.

The fact that persons who make reductions in their lifestyles to save carbon emissions only end up giving the big polluters more emissions is both wrong and sends the opposite message to the big boys, you don't have to do anything yet, alls well. This is far from the truth. And the free permits are far too generous to begin with, hardly showing a serious face here by the government.

Lets have carbon credits for personal household carbon cuts withdrawn from the market, lets set an ambitious renewable energy target and really try to achieve it, lets support the auto industry only for the building of low emission and zero emission vehicles, let them make the regular guzzling variety if they can sell them but without my tax dollar for support, lets get serious about food miles and stop freighting 'designer' water around the globe, lets lead from the front.

Australia is ripe with the brains to build a sustainable economy based on renewable energy and other resources, we only need a government that stops stifing innovation and instead supports it. And get some manufacturing capacity back on shore, we wont always be able to rely on imports being both cheap and available.

Sincerely,

Ross Lawrence, citizen of Australia

Dear Minister

Can you please re-design the CPRS scheme, my understanding is that Professor Garnaut did not propose compensating major polluters why is the government taking this path? Surely Professor Garnaut knew that businesses could go off-shore regardless. I like many others, wonder what such a low target will really achieve.

Yours sincerely
Julia Ward (Mrs)

I wish to add my voice to the addressing the inadequate targets proposed by the Australian Government in its climate change policies.

The 5-15% target proposed by the Rudd Government is not a realistic or convincing target to significantly reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

If, as much recent scientific research has discovered that the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt ENTIRELY within the next 5 years, its clear that climate change is happening much quicker than we (recently) even thought.

The UN Conference on Climate Change in December will hamper efforts to form crucial international agreement efforts. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme as proposed by the Rudd Government will ultimately be more harmful than beneficial. It appears to be a no-large-polluter-left-behind-policy, compensating large polluting energy corporations et al.

It seems obvious to a growing number of people that if we are to address this very possibly life threatening environmental disaster, we need to set realistically strong targets within a well designed scheme. The renewable energy industry is a bleedingly obvious way of the near & distant future which will eventually supply all, if not all, our energy needs. The greedy, over polluting fossil fuel energy corporations days are numbered.

The efforts of individuals & small businesses efforts to cut back the energy they use should NOT be an excuse for large polluting industries to continue their current dangerous level of energy consumption. They are the ones that need to be brought into line with the inevitability of the world moving to renewable energy suppliers.

The Rudd Governments weak target of 5-15% will not significantly reduce Australias total greenhouse emissions. This is the most important issue Australia & the world possibly will ever face. WE NEED REAL ACTION!! NOW!! Like more & more people Im getting really sick of the bullshit surrounding this IMPORTANT issue.

D.B.Valentine

Dear Senators,

I am extremely concerned about climate change and its imminent effects upon our health, environment and wellbeing. Climate change is happening and it is happening faster than previously predicted. This data has been presented at the recent Copenhagen meeting.

Despite Australia's potential to be a leader in green energy production and changing our lifestyles, the Rudd government is disappointing us all. Money spent on stimulating the economy could have gone a long way to converting our energy supply from dirty coal to solar or other technologies.

Setting weak targets sets a poor example and will lead to reaching "tipping points" earlier. The Garnaut report and the recent Joint Standing Committee on Treaties report recommend much more significant commitments, such as reducing emissions by 50% by 2020 compared to 1990 levels.

The Arctic is melting, the oceans are becoming saturated with carbon dioxide. The recent bushfires and floods experienced across Australia may be tip of the iceberg warnings of the devastating weather events we will witness. Our neighbours, such as Pacific Islands are also closely witnessing rising sea levels. The poorest nations will be those most affected, but Australia will not be immune.

Neither are we immune to taking action. The CPRS is a poorly conceived approach, which is more of a pollution permit scheme. It sets an unacceptably low target in the first place, and then ensures there is no incentive to achieve further reductions.

Help put the brakes on. Save our environment, our neighbours and our own health. Stand up for the Australian people who, whether they realise it or not, need strong leadership now.

Dr Kristen Pearson, MBBS, FRACP

The current government target for greenhouse gas reduction is pathetic! How can we say to our children that we acted responsibly upon hearing that sea levels will likely rise by 6 metres by 2100, and all we aimed for was a 5% reduction?

The very organisations that need to make the greatest reductions will, under the proposed scheme, be let off with little change! The coal and aluminium industries must cut back most - or we should not be using them. It's not a matter of everyone else making the changes so that they can continue to pollute!

When the Melbourne CBD is under water, what do we say to our children? What do we tell them about Venice? Low lying Pacific island communities?

Bite the bullet and be stronger in handling the vested interests!

Ian Goding

Please commit to a higher target than the government's 5-15%, which is totally inadequate given the changes that are already occurring in our climate. You only have to take note of the hotter summer & worse fires we had this season to know that climate change is only going to get worse. We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

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

Kind Regards,
Karen Graham.

Dear Senators,

I am extremely concerned about climate change and its imminent effects upon our health, environment and wellbeing. Climate change is happening and it is happening faster than previously predicted. This data has been presented at the recent Copenhagen meeting.

Despite Australia's potential to be a leader in green energy production and changing our lifestyles, the Rudd government is disappointing us all. Money spent on stimulating the economy could have gone a long way to converting our energy supply from dirty coal to solar or other technologies.

Setting weak targets sets a poor example and will lead to reaching "tipping points" earlier. The Garnaut report and the recent Joint Standing Committee on Treaties report recommend much more significant commitments, such as reducing emissions by 50% by 2020 compared to 1990 levels.

The Arctic is melting, the oceans are becoming saturated with carbon dioxide. The recent bushfires and floods experienced across Australia may be tip of the iceberg warnings of the devastating weather events we will witness. Our neighbours, such as Pacific Islands are also closely witnessing rising sea levels. The poorest nations will be those most affected, but Australia will not be immune.

Neither are we immune to taking action. The CPRS is a poorly conceived approach, which is more of a pollution permit scheme. It sets an unacceptably low target in the first place, and then ensures there is no incentive to achieve further reductions.

Help put the brakes on. Save our environment, our neighbours and our own health. Stand up for the Australian people who, whether they realise it or not, need strong leadership now.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Kristen Pearson, MBBS, FRACP

Every time I think of the tepid response of the current Government to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions after their encouraging pre-election promises, I am deeply saddened.

My wife and I try to reduce our impact on the planet but it seems that the CPRS will not allow us to make a difference.

We realise that committing to a tough greenhouse pollution target will be difficult for everyone but this is something that MUST be done if our world is going to be worth living in for generations to come.

Stop thinking short term!!! Life isn't just about making money, about keeping our industry fat-cats being happy by consuming more resources or trying to keep the world the way it has got used to living.

We are looking for inspiration from this government on this issue but it is seriously disappointing so many people..

Please, please do this for our people and the world.

Yours hopefully

Michael Heath

I am concerned that we may, as a nation, be making the mistake of being too conservative with regard to our planned climate change action. I appreciate that the current Global Financial and Economic Crisis is making it difficult to plan ahead, but we are acting boldly with regard to rolling out Broadband and need to be as bold with regard to pollution controls. We should not lag behind other developed countries in this regard. I am particularly concerned about apparent anomalies in the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. While it is important to accommodate big business and retain jobs, it is also important not to allow business concerns, national or multinational, to dictate terms to our government. We should not over-compensate polluters. Please ensure that any policies that are passed have enough leeway built into them to allow rapid modifications as these become necessary for us to keep up with reforms taking place in other countries.

Penny Lee, Maylands, Western Australia

Dear Mr.Rudd

We need a stronger ACTION on climate change. The government's weak 5% reduction is not acceptable.

Regards

Beth

It is obvious that climate instability is happening already and is not just a future myth. A 5% target is ridiculous in the face of this and needs reflection. A target needs to be based in reality.

The CPRS seems to pay polluters to keep polluting and is beyond ludicrous. Strong targets are needed, REAL targets are needed, and a visionary plan needs to be put in place. Obama has earned the respect of millions because of his fearless pursuit of what is important to the planet and to it's people in the environmental arena. What is Australia doing dragging it's feet thru the dark ages??

REAL targets are targets that can be met by householders, businesses and industry, in cooperation. Please revisit this appalling target and CPRS scheme and do something that will actually work for the good of the environment this time! Investing in sustainability and renewable energy is the most sensible way to invest in and stimulate the economy.

Regards,
Mairéad Cleary

Dear Senators and MLAs,

As one of the more enlightened and forward thinking nations, we have a responsibility to lead the way, as it were, on the issues around climate change. The increasing rate of negative climate change effects, demands that an enlightened forward thinking government respond with an even greater but positive voracity toward arresting these most damaging and potentially irreversible climatic changes.

I sincerely hope that my grandchildren might enjoy relative moderate stability of climate and be able to experience nature as it is today, albeit significantly altered from my day as a child.

Government priorities usually shift with business and public pressure. I hope that the currently elected government and opposition will be somewhat more futuristic in thought and action than those of the past and are collectively planning a future for Australians well into the next millennium. Please deliver some very affirmative policy on this issue regardless of cost. It is time for a re-examination of priorities!

Will the word 'future' mean 50 to 100 years or will future have an almost unlimited timeframe. It's your call, you are the folk closest to the legislative process! You have access to the research and projections regarding climate and many other issues.

The 'western world' has recently pledged trillions of dollars to 'save' poorly managed financial institutions, amongst others, with little accountability demanded in return.

As the folk elected to make the best choices for Australia's future, and hopefully influence many other nations, 'the ball is in your court'. The accountability for our future re the effects of climate change as well as other issues lie firmly with you, our elected representatives.

Please 'grasp the nettle' and make the hard decisions....not the decisions expected by business, or by the average tax payer. Make decisions based on the long term future of the planet!! Lead the way at a global level.

Please get passionate about this issue.

Yours sincerely,

John Cleeton

I wish to express my dissatisfaction at the governments weak climate policy. With this weeks revelation that an important ice bridge in Antarctica has collapsed and threatent to allow further ice to melt into the surrounding sea.it is more than adequate proof we are in serious danger. We should and could have acted years ago and I believe it was foolish and greedy not to have done so. The proposed 5% reduction in greenhouse pollutoin is laughable in this day and age. After decades of greed and neglect such a weak response to the future health of the entire planet for future generations is a shame on the government and people of Australia if we allow it to stand un amended. I don't believe we should be looking at preventing dangerous climate change but reducing the dangerous climate change already evident but blatantly iognored by most of the worlds economies. With such long periods of yearly sunshine why don't most Australian homes have affordable solar heating? Why, on large tracts of uninhabited land is there not thousands of wind generators supplying not only outlying communities but large towns with sustainable power. Why has the governmnets of Australia, for decades, failed to heed the warnings of scientists, environmentalists and well meaning citizens. All the signs were there but you have chosen t the 11th hour to begin to think of acting and then only poorly. Why are you so afraid of the greedy in our communities who consume and profit from polluting destroying not only our own fragile land but contribute to the worlds climate problem. Please act and be courageous, you will be hailed as visionaries by future generations.

Anne Tsoukalas

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you to ask you to vote against the Government's proposed 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gases by the year 2020. Yes, I agree that the Australia's economy is important, however I also know that the long-term economy of this country will soon be reliant on how well we handle climate change, and a waffly insignificant target will do nothing to help. Instead a target of 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels) would enable us to develop an economy designed to combat climate change, creating thousands of new jobs, and preserving the beauty of our land for our children and their children.

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

Yet when it comes to climate change, Australia is lagging well behind the rest of the pack. 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.

I implore you to demand the government adopt more effective and worthwhile emissions targets. For the sake of your children and mine.

Regards,

Tamasin Meller

We can not believe that the Rudd Government expects Australians to accept a pathetic reduction of up to 15% on greenhouse emissions. What difference will 15% make for goodness sake?

At the rate that climate changes are affecting our country, our world, we strongly believe the reduction figure needs to be 50%, (not 15%) by 2020.

Scientists all over the globe are discovering that climate change/global warming is far worse than ever predicted, & time is rapidly running out.

Surely the recent catastrophic bushfires in Victoria, & devastating flooding in other states should alert the Rudd Government to the consequences of ignoring the deteriorating changes in our climate.

IT'S TIME THAT STINKING, POLLUTING INDUSTRIES & THE GOVERNMENT PUT PEOPLE'S LIVES & LIVELIHOODS AHEAD OF GREED & PROFITS!

Kerri & Michael Thomas,

this is a once in a lifetime chance to make a difference for our country's and the world's future. get it up!

marie fox

Hey Kev and Peter, lift your game.
Regards
Robert

Dear government representatives,

As an Australian overseas in NY, I can tell you Americans are palpably relieved that President Obama is leading so strongly to reduce carbon emissions in this country. It is extremely disappointing to see that just a 5% reduction is Australia's goal, particularly as I believe this current government has the potential to make real change, such as Obama is making.

Have some courage and go for bigger goals, 5% won't do anything. People are glad to be finished with the Howard era, it's time for a new stance.

C'mon Australia, take a lead role.

Regards
Marcus Dervin

Dear Senators,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to the inquiry on the CPRS. I urge you to demand major changes to the Government's climate policy before passing it through the senate. The current proposed CPRS is deeply flawed and completely inadequate to deal with this climate emergency.

Australia needs, in the words of Environment Minister Peter Garrett, "evidence based policy", that will deliver deep cuts in greenhouse pollution of at least 50% by 2020, with incentives to businesses and individuals to reduce this even further. We should aim for climate neutrality, and even negativity in the long term. The evidence is showing that climate change is happening more rapidly than previously predicted, and projections show that if pollution is not rapidly reduced we face the possibility of entering into positive feedback cycles that will take this emergency out of our hands into unstoppable changes that will change the world as we know it.

It is true that Australia cannot do this on our own, but we need to be showing real commitment to this issue when we are going into world negotiations, and will benefit more from acting early to change our industries. It is our obligation to take responsibility for Australia's part in climate change and support the rest of the world in doing the same. There is huge public support to do what is right for the earth's sake alone, but it is also clear that financially it makes a lot more sense to prevent climate change than deal with the catastrophic consequences.

Please take the time to treat this issue with the respect it deserves at this crucial time in human history.

Yours sincerely,
Dr Sara Cameron

Australia's target for reducing greenhouse pollution by 5.15% is manifestly inadequate. The cost of committing to a higher target must be considered against the costs of not taking adequate action.

While recognising that the recent bushfires were caused by a range of factors, climate change would be widely accepted by the general public as one important factor in the severity of the Black Saturday fires. We are warned that we can expect our bushfires to become more severe as our climate becomes warmer and drier. What was the total economic cost of these bushfires? Do we need to budget for such costs each year?

We have serious problems with water. What are the economic costs of the proposed desalination plant and the north-south pipeline? These are current examples of the cost of not taking adequate action sooner.

We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels).

The proposed CPRS is badly flawed. It means that any savings made by individuals or organisations simply allow the major polluters to pollute more. A carbon tax would work better, with in-built incentives.

Betty Russell

The proposed change to the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme of 5-15% is not what Australians voted for when the Labor Government was voted in. The fires in Victoria should be enough warning to this country that strong measures need to be taken. For once, could Australia just show the lead? With the world economy in such a mess the problems we all have with global warming creates a great opportunity to look at new ways of approaching our problems. The economy and the environment are not separate issues, it is all the same. Most people in Australia feel this way; most of us have children and grandchildren, neices and nephews who MUST be given a future. We cannot delay on this any longer. By reducing the targets, by allowing the larger polluters more compensation will create a feeling of 'why bother' from so many of the population. We all have to work together equally - we have no choice! The world has changed, our hearts MUST open to the new reality!

Alison Hall
White Gum Valley,WA

To whomsoever it concerns, ie all people

The main argument for weak carbon emission reduction targets in Australia is that we can't make a difference, this precludes the power of leading by example, it precludes the possibility of discovering world class solutions and it is the language of defeatism, Australians are not defeatist.

We can make a difference, ask yourselves which nation should take the first bold steps? If not us then who?... I put it to you that of all nations capable of taking the initiative, Australia is foremost. We have first world wealth, we still have a cohesive educated society capable of rallying as a nation, we have social security and public health systems that will minimise hardship arising from economic restructuring and we are a young nation more open to change than others.

Above all we are decent people, If you believe that Australians are only interested in the hip pocket you have underestimated us.

There is a minority of people who are almost entirely money focussed, this is as it should in a free market economy but we can't allow their voices to be the only ones heard, their narrow vision will lead us down a path of prevarication that will cost us dearly. We don't want to be remembered as the self obsessed generation who kept our heads in the sand while the climatic balance shifted beyond repair.

Fact: In 40 years time with the benefit of hindsight all excuses for inaction will ring hollow.

We need a strong visionary leadership to rally our nation, one that will lead the call to arms in the war against climate change, we need a leadership that will position us at the forefront in research and development of the new technology boom that is about to take place.

It is said of our children that one of the signs of growing up is the ability to delay gratification, this is a defining moment in the history of Australia if short sighted greed and defeatism are allowed to prevail, if we stumble now, history will judge us harshly and our children will pay the penalty.

If you are a leader please dream big and aim high on behalf of our great nation.

Yours Sincerely

James Ford

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is not just a bad policy, it is worse than useless! A more appropriate name would be the Carbon Polluters' Rewards Scam. The CPRS, as it stands, would not only set a ridiculously low ceiling, but worse, it would set a floor that would prevent us from doing any better than 5% less greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions trading schemes are not the answer to mitigating climate change. What this country needs is brave leadership that truly encourages Australians to change their exploitative, over-consumptive ways.

Australia needs to completely stop the burning of coal (and also stop exporting it so that other countries cannot continue polluting) and other fossil fuels. Australia must seriously aim to have 100% renewable energy meeting a much lower demand (due to a simultaneous change in social behaviour) as soon as possible. This can only be achieved with strong top down legislation as well as support for grass roots movements to continue the good work they are already doing at the local community level, around the country.

Growing the renewable energy industry will provide jobs for those that will need to move from other polluting industries. The government must retrain these people to enable a fair and equitable transition to a low/zero carbon future. Those who are polluting the atmosphere with CO2 must be taxed or penalised to dissuade such activity and people and businesses doing the right things must be rewarded accordingly.

Anything is possible, but there has to be the political will. Unfortunately, this is currently lacking. I'm sure politicians have the best interests of the country at heart, but they are not listening to the public as they should. There is too much green-washing and interfering lobbying from large corporations who are only interested in maintaining business as usual - as long as there is money to be made doing what they're doing.

When the governments of this country stop catering to big business and start listening to the common person, true democracy will emerge. Then, this country can really begin to make amends for decades of excessive affluence and the mindless pursuit of economic growth, which does nothing but destroy the environment. A healthy environment has to be the foremost concern of anyone, as it is the basis for a healthy society, which in turn can produce a healthy economy. Any future economy of Australia really needs to be based on a zero carbon philosophy - a steady state economy.

Sincerely,
Eric Nicholson

Australia needs a bold & responsible target to reduce greenhouse emissions by 50% for the year 2020. If our Government is as educated & committed as its very own public on climate change then we can be sure that the exhaustive amount of evidence & scientific research is being adhered to.

In the face of this alarming & most paramount issue of Climate Change, our future & most of all our childrens future in this Global Community depends on this current Australian Governments' accountability. We need to join in solidarity with other nations at the UN Conference for Climate Change.

Wealthy Industrial Companies should have the resources & brains to employ renewable energies. It's the most baffing fact of all to many that the aforesaid has not been implemented.

I am a single parent/student on a low budget & I need to know that the extra money that I spend on Green Energy, our family's commitment to being waterwise, to recycled to walk, bike ride or compost is making a difference for my childrens' future, not to the pockets of the greedy who see no future & dont seem to care!

Lift the cap so we Australians can lift our chins & work as one with our Government & the rest of the world on this crucial issue.

Regards please

Kitty J. Martin

Greetings,

Australia has much to lose by not taking strong action on climate change: more drought, more devastating forest fires, more loss of habitat for Australia's unique wildlife.

Yours truly,

Madeleine Murray

Please accept this submission to the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme review.

Firstly, the carbon reduction targets set as a component of the scheme are far too conservative. If we can aspire to lead the Western world in the roll out of Broadband technology surely we can show strong vision in setting greenhouse pollution targets that will reduce green house and its impact on our vulnerable Australian environment.

Secondly, the proposed CPRS has very limited ability to actually achieve the outcomes that it sets out to achieve given that corporate polluters can effectively be enabled to increase, or at least fail to reduce, energy usage by reduction in householder energy usage. There are few incentives for big polluters to change their behaviour.

Lastly, instead of considering responses to climate change that seek to coax polluting businesses to change their ways using a weak scheme, why not identify the opportunities here for an inevitable re-visioning of industry and workplaces and get enthusiastic about green technologies and sectors of the future before we lose market share in the new areas due to tardiness?

Thanks for your consideration of this submission.

Carolyn and Rod McArthur

I believe the Governments carbon reduction targets are dangerously inadequate. Overwhelming scientific evidence shows that climate change is occurring more rapidly than anticipated and the results of insufficient action will be catastrophic.

The worst aspect of the proposed scheme seems to be that any voluntary action taken by the community have no effect as it simply allows the big polluters to do less. This robs individuals of the chance to make a difference which is the only way for the whole society to take responsibility for our effect on the planet.

Australia's position on climate change must be decisive and effective if we wish to persuade other countries to tackle the issue seriously.

Sincerely,

Simon McCutcheon

To whom it may concern,

The government must reconsider its targets with urgency as they are insufficient. Climate change is happening faster than previously thought, and drastic reduction in greenhouse pollution is necessary to try to avoid dangerous climate change.

Heidi Cripps

Yes, we do! But what our representatives in the parliament are doing doesn't reflect our strong wish. If they don't take the scientists warnings seriously and act now, some science fiction scenarios will come true: unlivable earth.

I strongly urge that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme be revised with a much greater target of 50%. This way I can feel it's worthwhile joining the scheme by such as installing solar micro-generator on my roof; instead of the saving I made being given to some industries to increase their carbon emission level.

From Kimiko Semba

Dear sirs,

Australia needs to lead the world in taking action to minimise climate change, for our own national interest as well as the world's. Someone must make the first move. The need does not need to be explained- it's a no-brainer. And it's not like it's hard to do. An immediate subsidy to put solar panels on every roof in Australia, owned or rented, would allow present power stations to be used for industrial purposes and reduce domestic demand by huge proportions. Follow the German example and pay triple the rate for grid purchase of surplus home-generated power than for home purchase of power station-generated grid power. This gives the consumer financial incentive to pay to put panels on every available surface, an incentive that has been proved to work in Germany, which has a climate much less amenable to solar collection than Australia's but now has one third of its power generated by solar. The savings in removed need for national grid upgrades and new power stations will m

ore than compensate for the installation and purchase costs of solar panels. And if the government buys solar equipment in the bulk required, the costs saved will also help subsidise the installation expenses. Forget clean coal and nuclear power. Subsidised solar panels for consumers is both an immediate and a long term fix that saves huge amounts of carbon pollution now and in the future. If we build our own panels etc with existing Australian innovations we could build an export industry that would create Australian jobs while it directly addressed a world problem and supplied a worldwide need for cheap efficient solar panels. IT'S REALLY NOT THAT HARD!!!

Thank you- please act now!

Elena Garcia,

self sufficient solar power consumer.

The governments 5-15% target is not adequate to avoid climate change. Scientific evidence has shown that the rate of change is faster than thought and the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt entirely within 5 years. Our weak target is undermining efforts to form international agreements and must improve before the UN Conference on Climate Change. The CPRS is badly designed to do more harm than good. The design scheme overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community environment. A strong target needs to be set to ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small business take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the governments weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under the gap.

Anne McMurray

As a citizen of Australia I was most disappointed at the low carbon emissions target of our government. As you can hear or see almost daily in the news, the ice cap on the poles is melting, the sea is rising, and people in low areas are suffering loss of life and loss of livelihood. 5% is totally inadequate and I would request that a target of 50% by 2025 be set.

Yours sincerely,
Dieter Tieman

I appeal to you on behalf of myself and my husband, our children, our grandchildren, and all of our loved one please please Stand Up and Be Counted as the Generation that fully addressed this issue of Climate Change.

I urge you to Have a Heart for us and for all future generations and please commit Australia to reducing greenhouse pollution by 50%.

Let Australia take the lead here as after all we are still the Lucky Country in so many ways - what a great life we have here in Oz. Not one of us can ignore this climate crisis.

I implore you to have the courage and act now - you are the spokespeople for all Australian citizens let the world hear how we Australians are committed to making a difference.

Thanks for all efforts,
Monica Auldrige (and Michael and the crew)

In the last election I supported labor (after having not voted labor for many years) because I believed it was serious about tackling climate change. However, the 5 to 15% target proposed by labor does not address the problem at all. So I'm writing in the hope that the labor government will actually do what it was voted in to do -- address climate change with a decent carbon emission target and a workable scheme to meet this target.

It's estimated that we need to commit to reducing our greenhouse pollution by 50% of 1990 levels by 2020 to even have a hope of slowing dangerous climate change.

Addressing climate change is far more important than protecting the interests of coal mining and oil companies. Already, the arctic sea ice is predicted to melt completely within five years... that's 2014.

Permafrost is also melting, which will release more carbon and further speed up the process of climate change. Our national treasure, the Great Barrier Reef is dying. Nearby island nations are in danger from rising sea levels, and Australia, like many other nations, is witnessing increased extreme weather events such as floods and bush fires.

We need to commit to a reduction of greenhouse pollution by 50% before 2020. And instead of hiding behind excuses of protecting the economy as reasons to placate big coal and oil, we should instead be building a sustainable economy by supporting growth industries in renewable energy.

Under the current proposed scheme, even if individuals and small companies attempt to reduce their carbon emissions, this simply means that big polluters will be able to increase their emissions, because of the floor that has been imposed by the CPRS. This just doesn't make any sense.

Australia has a responsibility to the rest of the world to make decent targets. The CPRS needs to be reworked urgently, before the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen this December.

I am still hoping that Labor will listen to its constituents on this matter. I urge you to do everything in your power to revise the current targets and instead aim to reduce our greenhouse pollution by 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020.

Yours sincerely,

Louise McCabe

Please explain how we can be supporting climate and environmental problems and preaching to the rest of the world while still supporting logging of old growth forests, supporting expansion of Newcastle Harbour for coal export(isn't this a global problem?)and numerous other paradoxical and contradictory actions by the Australian Government.

Don't let me get started.

Increasingly, I believe policy is being driven by media representations and hype.

Let's get real and really look at our impact, locally, nationally and globally.

Could Peter Garrett please resume some authenticity and credibility.

Like so many before him, he has become a tool of the Party and no longer a credible spokesperson for the Environment.

Would the real Peter Garrett please stand up and not just for a PR opportunity at a rock concert.

All is froth and bubble but the costs of neglect and stupidity are now very grave indeed.

Sincerely,

Lyn Maciver

THE FACTS IT IS REAL OIL PEAK IS REAL MASS DESTRUCTION IS REAL
ACT NOW OR SLEEP FULLY KNOWING YOU ARE A MASS MURDERER
MARTIN

as politicians who have the opportunity to make an impact and ensure we take responsibility for the rapidly accelerated environmental crisis and the human suffering that is developing as a consequence- you should be hanging your heads in embarrassment for weak choices which lack courage, caring and allow money interests to play God with our future.

Please do the right thing - follow the obama line of thinking and we will also begin to shine.

With thanks for your consideration,

Eva Migdal

Dear Parliamentarians

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission.

I submit that the government's current target is too weak. On my understanding of climate change science that target won't avoid dangerous climate change; it won't even come close.

I support a commitment to reducing emissions by half (on 1990 levels) by 2020. I submit that given the certainty of grave consequences for present and future Australians of failing to do so, this is both a necessary and reasonable target for a responsible government that has ready access to climate change research and a willingness to act in the public interest.

I also submit that given climate change is already occurring, and scientific findings are now being revised backwards, this commitment needs to be made urgently. I would like to see the new target adopted this year.

In addition to opposing the current scheme for its weak target, I oppose it for its reward of polluters and its undermining of the decades of strong vision and hard work willingly contributed by so many people, me included. I submit that a scheme constructed this way is both fundamentally unfair and grossly unwise in making our lives and the lives of other species reliant on those who have shown most contempt towards those lives.

I submit that the benefits of committing to the target I have suggested within the time frame I have suggested include:

- our best chance of persuading international communities to commit to an adequate target
- our best chance of avoiding dangerous climate change and its effects
- certainty, so that people can make medium and long term decisions and implement them
- benefits for those who produce means of reducing emissions eg producers of renewable energy
- improved social cohesion through a public shared purpose.

Yours faithfully
Tonia Brajcich

To whom it may concern,

I am extremely concerned about the pace our climate is changing. The latest massive ice sheet to come off Antarctica is highly concerning and yet is just another clue that we have been negligent in our care and protecting of our planet for all animals that live here and for future generations.

Caring for jobs is one thing but inaction on climate change will have far greater and far more detrimental effects on people's lives than just losing their jobs. Would so many people have died in the Victorian fires if we had taken warnings about climate change seriously thirty years ago? What about the people who will be forced to move when sea levels rise? And why are preserving jobs and action on climate change mutually exclusive? Surely there are enough smart people in the country to figure out how we can protect the economy and save the environment at the same time?

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

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

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 is utterly disgraceful and must be rectified.

Please make the tough decisions and lead us as you have been elected to do.

Yours sincerely,

Natalie Cole.

The climate change target recommended by Garnaut was not radical; Australia should at least commit to that level of reduction. A failure to offer a meaningful target undermines concerted international action. The time has long since passed for prioritising economic considerations above the environment.

Barbara Sandeman

It is with earnest sincerity that I commend Australia to reduce greenhouse pollution on 1990 levels, by 50% by 2020. Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years; Our international agreement must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen; the government CPRS scheme over compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment; strong targets well designed will encourage new growth industries in renewable energy and avoid dangerous climate change; the CPRS, Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, as it stands, only imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, but make room for industry to increase their emissions under the cap with the actions of individuals and small businesses efforts to reduce energy completely wiped out.

Wishing you all the best and look forward to fine leadership.

Sincerely,
Sandy Edwards

Dear Mr Rudd, the continual loss of jobs from the coal industry demonstrates its a dinosaur industry, we haven't even seriously tackled renewable energy in this country so the loss of jobs can't be blamed on it.

You were voted into office because people were sick of the duplicity of Howard and co and most of us believed you would actually do something about climate change that was substantial and meaningful. To date you have been no better than Howard, a disappointment.

Even the US has exposed how pathetic your targets are by setting goals that should embarrass your government. As much as I want to see a fast Internet and investment in other public infrastructure, I also want to see more money spent on renewable energy and less subsidisation of polluting fossil fuel industries.

So long as you continue to give the fossil fuel lobby what they want, they will continue to cry poor and refuse to change their ways.

The voters fulfilled their end of the bargain when they voted you into office. It's time you repaid their support with meaningful action on climate change and support for renewable energy industries.

Regards,

Blair Donaldson

I feel betrayed by the Rudd government. After grandstanding in Bali by signing the Kyoto Protocol the government has set carbon reduction targets that are laughable, if the situation were not so serious. A 25% to 50% reduction is what is required and must be our aim at Copenhagen. Anything else will undermine the world stand on this issue. Australia needs to be leading not cowering on this critical issue.

The Wilks ice shelf is crumbling as I write and all climate change predictions seem too conservative. We must keep carbon emissions below 400 ppm to avoid catastrophic climate change. Australia's targets won't achieve this.

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. The scheme is extremely complex and needs to be replaced with a far simpler and easier to implement Carbon Tax.

I am extremely disappointed that the proposed CPRS will not take account of domestic carbon reduction activities and in fact will operate to make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Yours sincerely
Simon Clough

Dear Committee,

Australia needs to exercise leadership in climate change policy and agree to much stronger targets. Climate change is happening faster than originally thought and could well have devastating consequences. In the light of these facts and the current global financial crisis it is important to take a positive step towards sustainability and reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and reduce our carbon footprint.

The current schemes planned do not seem to be strong enough or well designed enough to really address the issues.

A major re-think is needed, as is recommended by Sustainability Development UK in their paper Prosperity Without Growth (http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications/downloads/prosperity_without_growth_report.pdf) . They make a clear case for the environment unsustainability of the growth economic model, and point to some avenues which need to be explored to ensure survival on the planet.

Please consider the needs of future generations, looking at a longer time frame than 3-5 years in your deliberations.

Thank you,
Sky de Jersey

I'm writing to urge you to reject the CPRS.

Emissions trading hasn't reduced carbon emissions in Europe, and the design of Labor's CPRS seems to have incorporated some of the worst features of Europe's system, while adding some doozies all of its own.

Free permits and compensation to Australia's biggest polluters not only negates the "polluter pays" principle that justice demands - it perversely rewards the biggest polluters or at least fails to deliver the disincentive to pollute the scheme is said to be for.

Allowing overseas offsets hinders the transition to a post-carbon economy that is required in Australia. There are numerous reports of schemes that are of at least dubious value in terms of emissions reductions (infamously, an increase in HCFC production by companies that would then capture and destroy it, generating credits and a lot more revenue than they would have by making the HCFC's for refrigerants... it took years to close that loophole), and which may entail other environmental and social harm. Big companies want to deal with other big companies in purchasing bulk quantities of offsets. So unequal power relations existing between communities and multinational corporations are reinforced by international offset schemes. Carbon dioxide emission reduction in Majority World nations should be supported on their own merits, and if they promote other social and ecological goals - not so that they can absolve corporations of the so-called "First" World of their obligation to cut emissions.

The target in the CPRS is a shocker. While the latest scientific findings point to the conclusion that warming is with us sooner and stronger than predicted by the last IPCC report, and while the melting of Arctic sea ice indicates anthropogenic warming is already dangerous, the 5% target in the CPRS legislation, if adopted by the rest of the world, is a recipe for suicide. And if not adopted by the rest of the world, what does that mean? That yet again, the Australian negotiating team will be trying to pull the world away from taking the urgent action needed to avert catastrophe? There's nothing morally defensible about such a position.

Humanity is confronted with potential disaster. Time is not on our side. We must pull out all stops to peak carbon emissions, reduce them to zero, and find the ways to pull carbon out of the atmosphere. NASA's James Hansen indicates that the safe-climate target we probably need to aim for is 300ppm CO₂ - much less than the 392 it was recently reported to be. (Researchers in Norway report that atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide rose to 392 parts per million (ppm) in December, up 2-3 ppm from the same time a year earlier. Reuters, Feb. 12)

We simply don't have time to fool around with an untested, unproven market mechanism that on any clear-headed reading seems designed more with safeguarding the profits of Australia's big carbon polluters, than with planning for Australia to make its fair share to the global task of reducing greenhouse emissions on an emergency basis.

We would be far better off to:

1. acknowledge the scope of the problem. It's an emergency. Read David Spratt and Philip Sutton's excellent work, "Climate Code Red" if you're not yet convinced of this.

2. Adopt a confident approach that working together, we can find ways to overcome difficulties, so as to ensure a safe climate for all people, all generations, and all species. Subject to further scientific refinements, this means adopting a target of getting to 300ppm CO2 as quickly as possible.

3. More specifically, develop a plan to ensure we cut emissions - by at least 60% by 2020, starting with a move to 100% renewables in that timeframe, and adding in cuts from transport, agriculture, buildings, etc. The most efficient way to do this is through public funding: publicly owned energy utilities must be tasked with overseeing transition to renewable sources of energy, maintaining jobs (with retraining if necessary) for affected workers. Similar concerns for livelihoods and communities should underpin retraining and job guarantees for coal industry workers, within a plan to phase out coal mining and export within 10 years.

4. Australia has a special obligation to fund measures to assist Majority Nations communities to adapt to climate change, and to develop carbon-free economies. As the OECD country with the highest per-capita emissions, and as one that has played a spoiler role in international negotiations to date, Australia has a lot of ground to make up - perhaps better put, reparations to pay. A justice-based approach means we should open our doors to climate refugees, and should open the purse-strings to grant additional funding for climate adaptation/ sustainable development. (This should be on top of, not instead of, previously existing commitments and obligations.)

These four things should be at the heart of Australia's climate policy. If we get it wrong, there may be no future generations to condemn us - what an indictment that would be!

Kamala Emanuel

To Whom it may concern...And in this subject it is ALL of us living on the planet.

Quite simply the Australian Government needs to improve on it's weak Climate Change Targets.

There is adequate scientific evidence that climate change is happening quicker than previously thought which is why we need to have a far quicker response to this situation. Just take a glance at how people are living and the level of consumerism!! It is not hard to see that it is far from sustainable and in this process the planet is suffering. With the economy slowing we need to rethink how we are living and focus on setting targets that will support growth industries in renewable energies and more sustainable communities. In my own idealistic world I feel that these communities would also weather any future economic crisis far better.

Thankyou for your consideration and I hope you will be inspired to take action by setting stronger targets to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution.

Justine Eldin

We need to drive commitments higher by investing in renewable forms of energy and transports during this time of economic downturn and placing more emphasis on consumer-driven change - which means including domestic consumption in the CPRS.

Tein McDoald

I would urge you to consider very carefully the task before you. The future of our children and grandchildren lie in the balance.

The government's target of 5-15% reduction is totally inadequate. Moreover the CPRS mechanism actually demotivates individuals and small businesses from making reductions of their own - they will have no effect!

The latest data coming in from around the world is telling the story that observed and measurable changes are happening faster than ever expected. Now is the time to strengthen our targets above the weak 5-15% planned.

Australia, although not a major global power has a position of influence. We must do more to show the world we are serious and they need to be, too, for all our sakes!

Thank you
Chris Pryor

The CPRS in draft legislation will not work and will probably make things worse.

The Bill provides that a national emissions cap will be set, but allows Australian emissions units to be created and distributed that will exceed this cap.

It will not limit Australian emissions units created by eligible reforestation projects.

Kaye Bryan

In terms of the natural environment and its inherent beauty, can you think of one instance where human activity has made it better than the original. If it is, as I suspect, you can not, remember that it evolved with atmospheric carbon levels way below there current state. If you have the hide to call your self leaders, tell us where your leading us and what it looks like with CO2 levels at 350, 400, 450 ppm; not for me, for my grandchildren. andy glenn

I would like to express my extreme disappointment at the Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by a mere 5-15% by 2020. This target is pathetic! We need to set and reach seriously bold targets if we are to have any hope of tackling the climate crisis.

We need serious investment in renewable energy and "green collar" jobs.

We are all aware of rising unemployment, but why can't Australia lead the way for creating jobs associated with, for example, manufacture of solar panels and rainwater tanks, or hybrid cars or any other ecologically sound product.

Why aren't we investing in setting up apprenticeships for our unemployed youth so that they can become experts in installation and maintenance of technology associated with tackling the climate change crisis?

Why not aim to convert as many toilets as possible to be flushed with rainwater rather than potable water? Every school? Every public toilet in a park or recreation ground?

We gain absolutely nothing by ignoring the magnitude of the problem.

Furthermore, we need to ensure that big polluting companies are held to account for their polluting activities.

It seems to me that the taxpayer will be footing the bill for the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

I urge the Senate to put utmost pressure on the Rudd Government to take a bold and meaningful approach to cutting greenhouse pollution, rather than the weak 5-15% target which is ridiculously low.

Thank you.

Regards

Barbara Taylor

I was horrified to hear of the Government's paltry target for carbon emission reductions, and the planned spending to prop up polluting industries.

A 5-15% reduction target is not nearly enough to make a significant difference to the climate change predictions. And the proposal of conditional targets based on International factors is very, very disappointing.

I want to see Australia act as an international leader on this issue, and commit to a 50% reduction in emissions.

I am willing to accept the impact on my lifestyle and the cost of living. I am personally prepared to pay more taxes to support the necessary changes.

But I am not prepared to prop up polluting industries - for that is what the CPRS proposal will result in.

I want to see the "decisive action on climate change" which was promised during the election. I want to see funds allocated to renewable energy schemes. I want to see commitment to the fundamental changes to the economy which will be necessary; the phasing out of coal burning, a shift to clean industries, and energy efficiency regulations.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Webber

I would like to express my extreme disappointment at the Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by a mere 5-15% by 2020. This target is pathetic! We need to set and reach seriously bold targets if we are to have any hope of tackling the climate crisis.

We need serious investment in renewable energy and "green collar" jobs. We are all aware of rising unemployment, but why can't Australia lead the way for creating jobs associated with, for example, manufacture of solar panels and rainwater tanks, or hybrid cars or any other ecologically sound product. Why aren't we investing in setting up apprenticeships for our unemployed youth so that they can become experts in installation and maintenance of technology associated with tackling the climate change crisis? Why not aim to convert as many toilets as possible to be flushed with rainwater rather than potable water? Every school? Every public toilet in a park or recreation ground? We gain absolutely nothing by ignoring the magnitude of the problem.

Furthermore, we need to ensure that big polluting companies are held to account for their polluting activities. It seems to me that the taxpayer will be footing the bill for the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

I urge the Senate to put utmost pressure on the Rudd Government to take a bold and meaningful approach to cutting greenhouse pollution, rather than the weak 5-15% target which is ridiculously low.

Thank you.

Regards
Barbara Taylor

To all who will listen,

Please listen. Climate change is of extreme concern for many, and hopefully all, people. The governments 5-15% target for reduction, to me, is like throwing a bucket of water on the recent Victorian bush fires. I have recently had solar panels and hot water installed and although this is wonderful and every little bit helps, I can't help but wonder WHAT IS BIG INDUSTRY DOING? There is so much in the media to encourage the individual to do their bit for climate change and programs on families reducing their energy output, I ask - When will this type of awareness pressure be put on industry? It is time we make some major changes and that means industry! When is the government going to stand up to the real climate and environmental issues and put the people, children and our future before profit? Come on Kevin, I hope you are the man for the job.

In sincere prayer for the future,
Heidi Wilson

Australia must act immediately to slow climate change.

We must aim to achieve the targets of 40% or 50%. The current targets of 5-15% are inadequate to prevent a global disaster.

Australian government must take leadership in this matter.

Pollution reduction schemes will only reduce emissions if polluters are made to pay, directly or indirectly. Yes this will change the face of some businesses. However other green businesses will emerge and flourish. We must not fear change that we can control: we can direct how the economy and businesses adjust under new laws for emission controls. On the contrary, the change that we should fear is the change that will come about due to inaction or insufficient action to reduce the rate of climate change. Refusing to address this issue is akin to burying our heads in the sand.

Therefore:

Please set clear and meaningful targets for emission reduction (40%)
Please instigate a carbon tax to reward the efforts of the population to reduce emissions. A tax, passed on as costs to the electorate/consumers will be the quickest way for consumers to make informed choices, and choose to reduce their emissions.
Please act quickly!

Alison MacGregor

The Government proposes that the CPRS be the centrepiece of its climate change policy. The CPRS will not succeed in reducing Australian emissions because there is no limit on how many international permits or offsets polluters can purchase. The free permits come at the cost of permit revenue that could be directed toward investment in green energy technologies.

Compensation for trade exposed energy intensive industries is badly structured and funds could be more usefully directed to green technologies. See, for example, Ross Garnaut's comments in Four Corners 'Heat on the Hill' March 9 2009

"I think there are some aspects of design that could be improved. I think it's very important to have alongside the emissions trading scheme strong public investment in research, development and commercialization of low emissions technologies. That's not there as part of the current arrangement. I see that as an integral part of the scheme, very important for making the Australian scheme work efficiently at moderate cost. But also very important as part of a global agreement. One feature of the design of the scheme is that a high proportion of the permit value has been pre-empted. A substantial part going to compensation for low income households and I don't quibble with that for a moment. In fact it's essential. Power generators, petrol refineries will simply pass on most of the cost of the permits and that will increase the cost to Australian households. For low income households that will be a significant burden. It's appropriate to use a substantial part of permit revenue to protect those people. But a very large part of the remaining permit value is being given free to various emitters. I don't see any justification for that part of the value which is being given to generators who are selling into the domestic market. Fortunately that's a once-for-all payment but it's rather a large payment of money that could have been used for something else.'

Garnaut also says compensation will be difficult to phase out even when other countries put a price on carbon and our exporters no longer face a disadvantage.

"There is a principal[ple?] reason why trade exposed industries need transitional support. If we are taxing carbon more heavily than competitors in global markets then that may lead our exporters of emissions intensive goods to reduce their production too much. This is a complicated point but the general point is that there's a valid case for compensating trade exposed industries for the fact that other countries do not have comparable carbon pricing. The White Paper accepts that that is the right principle. But in practice the White Paper goes about compensating trade exposed industries for the fact that we have a carbon price. The difference between the two approaches can be quite important and can be very important in future. An approach that is favoured by the Review that compensates our trade exposed industries for the fact that other countries don't have comparable carbon prices will automatically phase out as we move towards a global agreement. If, for example, there is a wonderful outcome at Copenhagen, unlikely though that may be and we do have universal carbon pricing, then under the formula of the Review the support for trade exposed industries would automatically phase out.

Q. If a wonderful agreement, an ambitious target, is adopted at Copenhagen the trade exposed industries will keep getting 90% of their permits free even though their competitors now face a carbon constraint. Is that the concern?

A. The White Paper requires 5 years notice. They would keep getting them for 5 years. But even more importantly there's no clear process through which the phasing out takes place and I'm afraid that the phasing out would end up occurring through a political process. Under the proposal of the Review there's an automatic phasing out as other countries adopt carbon pricing. With the proposals in the White Paper it would not be automatic, there would need to be judgement, assessment and therefore another political process."

Yours sincerely
Gayle Adams

Dear Mr Rudd,

Every night when my small daughter is asleep I check in on her and look at her small sleeping face and wonder what kind of world she'll grow up in. Rising seas, species death, water shortages, food shortages, extreme weather events, mass movements of people displaced by famine and other climate-related ills. Some of these things are already happening. Most will happen. And yet your government has done worse than nothing.

When you were elected you said climate change was the issue of the century. Yet your government has clearly decided to 'run dead' on it. Your climate change minister, Penny Wong, has acted as little more than a chaperone for the worst elements of the fossil fuel lobby into the inner sanctums of government.

Along with the unions that are dictating terms to your government, they have managed to reinstall at the centre of your thinking a false opposition between jobs and action on climate change. In tacitly accepting this proposition, which is reflected in your extraordinarily weak carbon reduction targets, you have simply taken on board the thinking of the previous government. And sought to appease precisely the same groups (who will never be appeased), thus undermining any sense that many people have of real franchise; what point in voting for one party or another when the same lobbies hold sway?

You came to government talking about the previous government's ten wasted years on climate change and now you have wasted another two. And counting. But where they did nothing you have compounded your inaction by locking in an extraordinarily low target. While we might have a small population, this matters because we are the highest per capita emitters on the planet and therefore have a moral responsibility to lead on this issue. Instead you have sent a message to other nations that advanced western nations think its OK to emit high levels and to hand out massive concessions and taxpayer dollars to high polluting industries, even as the pace of climate change now exceeds even the most pessimistic forecasts of five years ago.

While we watch Antarctic ice shelves melt and fall into the sea and as it becomes clearer on the basis of evidence as opposed to projections, that the tipping point at which global warming takes on its own momentum is being passed, your climate change minister arrogantly dismisses new action with a bravado that is breathtaking considering the mandate you had on this issue. A mandate that you have squandered.

Instead you sold us out to the emissions lobby. Worse, you have created a legislative regime where the things we do as individuals to reduce emissions will simply mean that the big emitters have to do less.

I dread the day when my daughter is old enough to know about climate change and to realise the effect it will have on her future. She will ask me, no doubt, why we did next to nothing. Given that her future and the future of all children, like never before, really is in the hands of leaders like you, perhaps you can tell me and the millions of parents like me; what should I say to her?

Mark Davis

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will not/cannot produce its stated outcome. Bad things happen when good men (this includes politicians of all persuasion) and it is time that the Government bites the environmental bullet and sets a strong target to ensure that future generations will thank us for our long sightedness and does NOT condemn us for our shortsightedness. June Wilson

To whom it may concern

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

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.

Let's make a difference by thinking creatively about changing our industrial structures so that they are sustainable and climate-friendly. Let's put effort into bringing many sectors together to work out both short term and long term methods for change that benefit all.

Yours in hope, Alikki Vernon.

I can understand the politically pragmatic response to climate change of a low greenhouse reduction target and a CPRS that rewards the worst polluters but it is not good enough. The federal government has an opportunity, through the present world financial crisis, to reorganise Australia's energy economy around renewable energy sources by giving large financial incentives and support for R&D in these areas. Our survival depends on it. And why can't SMALL hybrid cars be built by Toyota here and not just family-sized cars? I am waiting to buy a small hybrid or electric car as are many of my friends who are past their 'family' stage of life.

I despair that the continuing power of the polluting energy industries over government energy policy will just see a continuation of the disastrous Howard government policies favouring coal and oil.

Mr Rudd, you are being very bold in a lot of areas - the broadband announcement yesterday being an example - but you are squibbing it on climate change. Please show some bold leadership on this issue and set more ambitious carbon reduction goals e.g. 50% on 1990 levels by 2020. It can be done if the political will is there. If life becomes impossible on this planet in the next 50 years, a fast broadband service is not going to mean anything at all.

Carolyn Williams,
Blue Mountains, NSW.

Dear Senators,

I call on your enquiry to investigate whether the governments proposed legislation will:

1. Weaken international negotiations by prematurely locking in maximum emissions targets for Australia
2. Allow big polluters to take advantage of the actions of individuals and small businesses to delay reducing their own greenhouse emissions.

Best regards,
Eugene Lubarsky, NSW