

Thank you for reading this email.

Firstly let me say that I am not a greenie or radical protester.

I am a middle aged man who is thinking of the future and doesn't like to think that I am handing over an Australia that is poisoned to our children and children's children. I don't want to be seen as the generation that could have made a difference, but didn't and worse, continued to destroy the environment.

I thought I was voting Rudd so that he would make the difference€ required, but I fear that it looks like more of the same. Maybe you, the politicians, are confused or caught up by the lobbyists, the bureaucrats and your own spin. But look inside your own heart and ask what do Australians want in the medium term? Is it more of the same and focus on economics, or is it a change to the new thinking and systems that will rid us of such outdated and harmful technologies?

A new and vibrant low energy model. Business will survive, they always will. I expect that they won't want change because there are risks and they have to think. Any change and they put fear around.

As a recent example, remember the anti-smoking heartache they gave us? Isn't it so much better now that the companies who lied and took the profits have been found out? Restaurants who claimed they would die because of "no smoking laws", didn't.

Well now with the energy consuming companies complaining, it feels very similar to when the cigarette companies complained and confused us, but this is being played out on a grander scale and for keeps.

So please look at the proposed Climate policy and add some common sense to it. Individuals need to change, but we need your help and guidance, I hope you can do that for us. You are in the best position and you can do this.

Thank you,
Glenn Bailey

I strongly urge the Government to increase the target for reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution. The current target of 5-15% is grossly inadequate.

I am concerned that the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good.

The Government needs to urgently set a strong target with a well designed scheme to ensure that Australia does its fair share in reducing the impact of climate change.

Yours sincerely

sue Brittain

This issue figured number one on my assessment of candidates and I am appalled and disappointed at the direction this Labour government is taking. Weak targets and the proposed CPRS scheme placate some now and leave the mess to the future.

If we think people induced economic disruption is a big issue now, then consider an environmental lead disruption, which we have left too late to manage, and the devastation that will follow because we are too lazy to make significant changes now.

Anne Fuchs

The target you have set is too weak. It is likely that with a target of 5-15%, industry obviously go for the minimum. If you set a higher target like 25%-35% then the minimum target for industry to achieve is higher. Get some balls K Rudd this is more important than everyone having superfast optic cable internet.

Oliver May

To whom it may concern,

It is my belief that only with more aggressive government-led measures will there be the necessary stimulus to the entrepreneurial spirit that will be our greatest asset in combating global warming. It goes without saying that a higher carbon reduction target is our biggest tool to achieve this.

As a middle power but big polluter, Australia is in a unique position to offer global leadership on this issue. But first, it is up to the government to end our dependence on coal and trigger the incentive for the business community to seize upon the inherent opportunities within the field of energy efficiency.

Please be strong enough to make the hard the decision and do what is right.

Many thanks,

Tim

Dear Senators,

I am appalled by the low 5-15% target proposed by the government. Australia can play a critical leadership role by making deeper emissions cuts and showing developing nations it is sincere about reducing climate change. Without nations such as ours showing this type of initiative, the likelihood of heading off catastrophic climate change is negligible. We should commit to reducing our carbon pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

By setting a stronger target, the government would position our community to make changes that, although potentially hard at first, will be ultimately rewarding.

Every new appraisal of our climate change status has been worse than previously projections. From a management point of view, it is obvious that we must now respond as if confronting the worst case scenarios, instead of blindly hoping for best case scenarios. Our actions now must be strong and effective. Delay and time-wasting are our greatest enemies.

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is way too generous to the big polluters. The free permits should be scrapped. In addition, the scheme should allow individual people and businesses to take actions that will reduce our emissions beyond the limits set by government.

The government's Solar Homes and Communities Plan is a deceitful work of smoke and mirrors. By creating and marketing phantom Renewable Energy Certificates (REC's), the program ensures that every home solar installation gives permission-to-pollute to polluters in a manner that ensures there will be more emissions, not less.

The government has a long way to go to meet even the most minimal credible response to climate change. Please help the government to step up to the mark.

Yours sincerely
Tom Collley

I write representing the many silent voices to wake-up from this madness and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Look with open eyes to the stream of new scientific findings showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement.

The CPRS proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme. Individual action will not reduce Aust's total greenhouse emissions beyond the weak 5-15% because of a floor imposed beyond which emissions cannot fall.

Please consider and act for the future while action can still redirect the future of our planet into a new rejuvenation.

Yours sincerely,
Lynda Birch

Why can't we pursue other avenues as well as this weak CPRS scheme? Other avenues such as alternative energy sources, better public transport etc. I know they will not solve the crisis alone but its a crisis with more than one solution and one that needs more than just one approach

Jane Routley

Dear Members of Parliament,

Please reconsider your action on climate change. According to available scientific research we need to act much quicker on reducing our greenhouse emissions to avoid environmental catastrophe. The vast majority of Australians want you to be tougher on polluters- please aim for 50% reduction by 2020. We will stand and applaud you!

Verity Cooper

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

Enter your letter here

To make polluters think, it seems vital that payment for carbon emission is charged, otherwise there is little incentive to lower emissions.

Despite our coal resources being important economically, there is no incentive to look at and research methods to use coal in other ways, for instance to convert it into other chemical products or less polluting ways of its use as a fuel.

Since Australia is a very large polluter and coal exporter we need to provide huge funds devoted to doing as suggested above, which may well produce new ways to earn our income in a better way. Our education is such, that is an achievable goal over time.

To keep that intellectual knowledge and to convert it to earnings for Australia, we need also to invest in keeping industries generated thus in Australia, even by encouraging part investment from overseas, but not letting it ALL go to USA or China or anywhere else. By all means let them invest with strict controls, but limited voting power in business decisions, so Australia can keep earning our way. Prudent thought and investment from the Future Fund could be used and my guess is that Leadership, not Followership by Government could persuade most thinking Australians to believe in securing our own future. Our loss of our solar lead is a good example.

Finally, we are a rich country, with much good fortune, so we owe countries less well off some leeway regarding their own pollution, until they can pay for better ways to do things, while at the same time assisting their educational and financial development. That would lessen likelihood of them developing terrorists among their less literate and less educated, who at present are easily led by zealots mainly interested in power.

Yours sincerely,
Alex Wood

To whom it may concern,

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

Regards,

Michael Boland

I ask that the target for reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution be raised to 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020 and that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme be redesigned to better meet that target.

Sincerely
Jill Manton

As a resident of South Australia's Riverland, I am surrounded by the evidence of disastrous past policies and inaction on the vital issue of climate change. I urge all of our nation's leaders to unite to set much higher targets that may have some impact in reducing greenhouse pollution and in providing a real example of our commitment to the rest of the world. Any economic costs will be far less than the cost of the destruction of our fragile environment and of disastrous bushfires, cyclones etc that are already increasingly wreaking havoc in our land. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme must be stronger without over compensation for the polluters. Please act strongly NOW. From Rosalie Richards

Australia is a country with much to lose from dangerous climate change, simply because of its geography.

With most of the population living on the coast, rising sea levels are a real threat to the livelihood of millions of Australians.

The effects of worsening El Nino periods are wreaking havoc on our water supply, another threat to the livelihood of millions.

Australia is in the position to make an adequate stance to avoid climate change, not only for Australia but for the world! We should instead be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 80% 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. The future is in renewable energy, not coal, and it's high time Australia caught up.

Laura Grainger

I have a copy of the "National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development" dated December 1992, 17 years have passed and we are still doing virtually nothing. It is disgraceful. The Government's target of 5 - 15% is quite inadequate to counter dangerous climate change when we are so close to the tipping point. We should instead be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020(on 1990 levels) The scientific evidence is now quite clear and even the climate change sceptics must begin to agree. We need real leadership on this issue Mr Rudd. This is an urgent crisis which needs your attention.

Joan Good, Traralgon

Dear Sir/Madam, I write to urge you to consider increasing Australia's reduction of greenhouse pollution to at least 20%, as I understand the USA has done. Australia is in an excellent position to lead the world, we have lots of sun light and a population very willing to take action.

yours sincerely

Wendy Davies

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is poorly designed and even provides benefits for corporate polluters at the expense of the environment. Savings made by households will be offset by more pollution from big business.

I believe the low target set by government is totally inadequate and should be at least 40% by 2020 based on 1990 levels.

Yours Sincerely

Norman Weedall

Dear sir, the governments 5-15% target is very poor and does nothing to reflect an international commitment to climate change.
In a better world money would not be the bottom line.
Please show greater concern for the environment, because without it we have nothing.

Rod Murray (West Wyalong, NSW)

Australia must reduce greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 if we are to slow the (already catastrophic) effects of climate change.

Millions around the world are already homeless as a result of significant climate events including inundation, floods, bushfires and cyclones. Others are starving due to drought and the failure of crops.

Climate change is upon us now. Because of our greed, ignorance, and arrogant refusal to listen the worlds greatest scientists, billions more will become homeless and starving. Ecosystems will continue to crumble. The economic downturn is but a drop in the ocean from which we can recover. Ignoring climate change is something that we will never be able to recover from.

Regards,

Yvonne

To all members of Government

An undue emphasis on economic consequences of policies to legislation for climate change is illogical. If the climate issues are insufficiently addressed the Earth becomes unlivable to humans - WHAT THEN!

LAUREL STOCKWELL

The government's climate policy has so far been very disappointing and has in no way allayed my anxiety about climate change. Like many people I have small children, and I believe we will be committing a crime against all future generations if we don't act responsibly now.

Reduce greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. The CPRS overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and our earth- this is not acceptable. This is Australia's opportunity to refocus our economy and make environmental sustainability an integral part of our economic thinking and planning.

Renewable energy offers a growth industry that we should be taking advantage of, we have so many people in Australia with the knowledge and the enthusiasm and we need government support to make it happen.

As far as we know there is no other nearby habitable planet, so let's get it right!

For our beautiful earth,

Miriam Brooks

As people of 80 years of age it is deeply concerning that the proposals for the target of 5-15% seems very inadequate in deed especially as climatic changes are occurring more rapidly than at first anticipated. As a country particularly vulnerable to climate change we should be leading the way and showing courage to other nations. We must commit to 50% by 2020. We will not be here but our grandchildren will be.

Ellis and Mary Reynolds

Australia's greenhouse pollution CAN be cut by 50% and i would like the government to take that stance.

Business, manufacturers, and the general public must all participate in reducing emissions and a strong stance by the federal government must form the backbone.

i am very concerned about the future for my young daughter and how the world will be when she is my age in several decades time. we must think of those future generations and make sacrifices today instead of being greedy and wanting more.

please therefore be a world leader and commit to 50% reductions by 2020.

thank you.

Sarah Gillis

As someone who does my utmost at home to reduce environmental impact i.e., energy saving light bulbs, only using electricity when we need it, paying extra to buy 'green energy' etc, I am very concerned that 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%. But rather, what we are doing at home which costs us more and is more inconvenient in terms of lifestyle, will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

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).

It takes more than individual action, it requires good, fast policy to turn things around.

Kind regards

Georgina Williams

I am really concerned that the way the CPRS scheme has been set up will not deliver GHG reductions required to stop dangerous global warming.

We need to encourage the world to be setting sufficient targets to address this problem, not making it easy for other to say they won't do their bit. Australia needs to be making major changes to its economy to remain relevant in a low carbon age - this scheme at present is not going to help that.

I will be voting on this issue alone at the next election, because of its importance.

Regards

Sally Fisher

Dear Sir/Madam

I am deeply concerned about the seeming capitulation of the Government to 'big business' on the issue of climate change. The imperatives all seem focussed on the economy, when people need to realise that, without a sustainable environment, there will be NO earth, ergo no economy.

I realise it is difficult to make big changes all at once, but feel that the 5-15% target is just not getting there. We need to aim much higher - perhaps 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

I hear every day of how dangerous climate-related changes are happening much more quickly than first anticipated. I feel that 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'm worried that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) you propose over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. I hear that the efforts I and my family have made to reduce our consumption of energy won't be recognised as part of this scheme, or that the big polluters will be compensated for my savings. That doesn't sit well with me. Is this the truth of the matter?

I am writing to seek reassurance, or at least an explanation of why you have chosen to undertake such a seemingly small reduction.

Yours sincerely

Maree Callinan

This is so serious that just as the Australian people are ready to take seriously the need to alter some of their habits so there must be expectations of industry which at present are polluting the planet at a rapid rate. The Government must take stronger action to encourage nonpolluting industries and not rely on high energy using industry such as desalination plants and brown coal in the Gippsland power station. or trying to find clean coal.
Please set strong targets and refocus the economy
Christine Fensham

How disappointing that the new Govt is so far taking such a weak line - do you want to set an example overseas of a country that cares about the environment for all - or only about our own industries??

I was one to vote in Labor , but at this rate I will only vote for minor parties in future.

Please be bolder in thinking of our future - not much use protecting industries if our grandchildren will live in ruined environments.

Sincerely

Bery Rosslyn

I have been invited by the Getup political lobby group to submit my thoughts on the subject of global warming.

The proposition that carbon dioxide is a primary cause of global warming/climate change has no foundation in science, but rather, is based on junk science in the form of a computer model which proves beyond doubt the truth of the saying "garbage in- garbage out". Computer models can be manipulated to prove almost any proposition, no matter how unlikely.

The weather on planet earth and the other bodies in our solar system is driven by the sun and the activities of man or any other entity, real or imagined, have at best a very minimal effect. This is a matter of science and common sense. The entire 'global warming scam', and scam it is, is driven by an agenda that you, ladies and gentlemen, are probably aware of, or at least some of you. This agenda has nothing to do with the welfare of the inhabitants of planet earth, but everything to do with developing a climate of fear amongst the many and the enrichment of a few.

Let it be known that not all submissions to these inquiries are in favour of more draconian measures supporting the fiction of global warming. I submit that the Australian Government should declare the proposition as unproven and act accordingly.

Sincerely,

Fabian Foale.

Mr Rudd, In most matters I, not aa labor voter, think you have done quite a good job, HOWEVER, when it comes to climate change, your party is s adly lacking. Get real, look at the evidence. Just a few days ago a giant Antarctic ice shelf collapsed, the perma frost in the Arctic is melting, here in Tasmania, our rainfall is falling.

Please, act now.

April Owen-Smith

Dear Sir/Madam,

The current proposal of 5-15% Greenhouse emission reduction is as foolhardy as not having the required regulation of the world financial system that could have averted a large part of the misery and uncertainty facing innocent people all over the world.

We are faced with a much greater crisis with Greenhouse. I therefore respectfully urge the Labor Government to adopt higher targets of 50% reduction by 2020. This should be supported by investment in alternative energy technology.

Peter Stork, PhD,
Australian Volunteer currently in Vietnam for AVI.

Dear Kevin and Penny and perhaps Peter

I am just writing to say that unless we act quickly and bravely the next generation will suffer. The latest science is really asking us to cut back on the present 380ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere. We actually should be heading back to 300 - 325ppm of CO₂. We can do this but we need your leadership. Prime Minister Howard will be forever remembered as the Prime Minister who refused recognise climate change as a reality. Please don't be remembered as the Prime Minister who accepted climate change but did little about it. That would be a greater condemnation than that directed at Prime Minister Howard. Please act and act now.

Yours sincerely

Tom Kingston

In the run up to elections, Australians were promised that the current government would take serious action on climate change. So far, the measures proposed have been wholly inadequate to address the dangers that climate change pose to humanity and our planet.

The Government's 5-15% target is insufficient to avoid dangerous climate change. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts at the international level to take the necessary action to avoid the worst effects of climate change.

Australia must act now to set a stronger target and do its fair share to curb climate change.

Natalia Scurrah

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

Regards,
Martin Stephenson.

i am deeply concerned that the targets of 5 - 15% are too low, that the emissions are not capped, that the number of free units to EITES is not capped, that assistance to coal fired generators is not contingent on a phase out plan, that reforestation projects under the CPRS do not exclude logging and can be "offsets" for industrial emissions, there are no third party rights established under the CPRS Act.

Carmel Wallis

To the leaders of this country. I would like you all to think long and hard before you commit your energy and resources to something other than reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution.

A target of 5 to 15% is totally inadequate in terms of avoiding further dangerous climate change. We are seeing the effects already from a century of industry.

Please do the right thing and make a push towards reducing our greenhouse pollution by 50% in time for 2020.

Please show the world that our politicians are truly leaders. Please show voters that you care more for the environment than you do the bottom line.

Yours sincerely,

Greer Ashworth

Dear Senate,

Please consider the overwhelming scientific evidence that climate change is advancing much more quickly than expected. We must quickly put in place a stronger, better designed scheme that rewards efforts to reduce emissions instead of rewarding the traditional polluters.

As a rich country we should be setting an example to others, not lagging behind them. The economic effects of not taking action will be more severe than anything seen yet, whereas there will be many new green jobs formed in the changeover to a sustainable economy.

The present CPRS discourages individual efforts to reduce emissions, only freeing up carbon credits for polluting industries to use.

Yours sincerely,

J.C. Andrews

p

I am writing to express my support for a strong emissions reduction target. While I understand the government is trying to play a difficult balancing game, the 5% target is completely unacceptable for one of the highest per capita emitting countries in the world, as well as one of the richest. We have the economic, social and technical ability to cut emissions by more, we must now do it.

Ian Rayner

I have just about had it with all u lot, increase the ercentage goal for reductions and get on with it. You will not be popular with everyone anyway, so at least do the right thing so people in the future can at say that u had a go.

thank you

paul wilson

Dear Committee members,

I believe the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is not environmentally effective . In particular I am concerned that the weak 5-15% greenhouse reduction target proposed by the Rudd Government are not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

I, as an Australian citizen, do not support this lack of action and feel that our action has already been delayed too long. The government is bowing under the pressure of the wrong people and needs to represent the citizens opinion not the businesses who dont want to change. I voted for the Rudd Govt on the basis of their committment to action on climate change.

I believe we dont have any more time to muck around and should target 100% reduction by 2020.

It appears to me that the science is showing that climate change is speeding up. I dont believe we have time to wait for the fairies to take action.

Where is the investment and incentives in proven schemes that will sent us on the right path now.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that as far as I can see will be do more harm than good. Rewarding polluters and not providing incentives for individuals to take action is wrong. I cannot see any reason why a polluter would bother to change their ways under the current scheme design.

I am more in favour of a tax system, but understand that it might be possible to design carbon trading scheme that could work. Again, in the first instance a stronger target is required. Australians per capita are high emitters we need to do our bit. Also the new industries that will assist the economy to make a change need to be better supported. The polluters need real incentives to change or phase out because they are no longer viable.

Overall the current design of the scheme is dangerously inadequate and unable to avoid dangerous climate change.

I do not support the scheme in its current state and hope the committee will consider these concerns seriously and advocate stronger climate action for Australia.

Tara Hawkins

These targets, if adopted world wide, will surely destroy our planet and all that lives on it as we know it. Does the government not understand what is at stake here? There are solutions, 1000s of them. We could even make money by developing them but the government needs to stop listening to the fossil fuel industry and take the lead on the BIGGEST issue in humanity's history.

For our children's children.

For all of us I hope you have the courage.

Eddie Roberts

I believe this is now our last chance to recover from our uninformed disregard for the earth we live in. But now we need to act immediately. The Money climate of today's media pales in comparison to the CLIMATE ISSUES we need to recover from. If we are looking for stimulate items to get things rolling, the CLIMATE or alternate energies are a great focus to address both issues. But have trying to appease the banking problem, we MUST INVEST in the future.

To focus our concerns on 'we the I am financially in a difficult position' & not look at the BIG ISSUE of climate change is INEPT. I urge that the people we have voted our trust in, will do the right thing for the future, the real future, not the short term of our present lives but the future of our PLANET where our KIDS will be able to REFLECT on what their prior caretakers have acted.

THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL PLANET WE ARE A GIFTED RACE OF PEOPLE WITH UNBEATABLE TALENTS, SO LETS NOT DEMINISH THIS, & ACT ACT NOW, INSTEAD OF LOOKING SHORT TERM.
from Geoffrey Drake.

To the Labor Party,

I am writing to you to bring it to your attention that I am strongly opposed to your CPRS scheme.

Allow me to begin by saying that I realise that with any policy announcement, there is going to be backlash from one side or another, and that it is more or less the government's job to find the balance.

On this occasion, the balance has been skewed horribly. While big business is certainly happy, the majority the valued "working families" feel that they have been cheated by by a government that they voted into power for this very reason.

There is some evidence which suggests that a cut between 5% and 15% is what is needed to stop runaway climate change from occurring. However, the overwhelming majority of studies have indicated that much more is needed. In a scenario where we have absolutely everything to lose, I would have thought that the government would not be so careless as to put a few meager dollars ahead of the safety of everything that we have.

I believe that in order to accurately represent those who voted you into power, it is important to take a realistic stance as to how to tackle the problems which the public deemed as needed solving. The CPRS method is criticised by many as being inefficient, and I am inclined to agree. I believe that a directly taxed system, and one with harsh penalties, is the way to go.

Disappointed,
Max Tandy.

Dear Mr Rudd,

We elected you with the keen expectation that you would provide world leadership on avoiding climate change, reversing Howard's head-in-the-sand attitudes. Instead, Australia has become the number one offender.

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).

Your 5-15% target is also not at all adequate to avoid defeat at the next election. Give us some real leadership to inspire people to cope with the difficult years ahead.

Bronwyn Vost.

I urge you to look beyond what the lobbyists might say its time to face up to our responsibilities, do the right thing and take meaningful action.

Greg Steel

Dear Senators,

I wish to express my deep concern in hearing of the Government's weak climate policy of a 5% greenhouse reduction target.

It is becoming increasingly clear from current scientific research that climate change is occurring at an extreme rate, and at a much higher rate than was previously thought. The effects of this we are already starting to see - just this week we all heard the news that an ice-shelf from the Antarctic peninsula broke away, and scientific research has led us to believe that the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to completely melt within the next 5 years.

This weak target leads me to believe that our Government is not taking this issue at all seriously, and to be honest, is embarrassing. It is telling the world that we are not going to stand up and take action to fight against climate change, and undermines international efforts to form meaningful agreements that will lead to change. It is sending a message to the Australian public that climate change is not a serious issue, and that our Government is not willing to invest time and effort into this issue.

I do recall that one of the reasons I voted for this Government was that they claimed they would stand up for climate change issues and be more progressive than our previous Government - so far, I can't see any actions that are backing up these statements.

Please reconsider the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme very seriously. We need strong targets and a well designed scheme so that we can do our part to combat climate change.

Yours sincerely,

Renee Tsatsis

I find it unbelievable that our politicians still need to be convinced to take strong action to reduce the impacts of climate change.

- Have they not heard Al Gore?
- Have they not heard Svern Suzuki's Rio speech?
- Have they not been touched?
- Does the Victorian fire tragedy not make sense?
- Do the floods in Australia's north east not raise concern?
- Are they not concerned about the millions in the third world that will suffer famine and devastation - as a result of our gluttonous life styles?
- Are they oblivious to the tomes and tomes that have been written about climate change?
- How many voices have been begging for DECADES to act on climate change / greenhouse effect / global warming - have these pleas not been heard?

I can only conclude that our 'leaders' are lacking in brain cells that enable an understanding of Earth, or that they are beholden to those that are anticipating fatter pockets from 'restoring' post devastation.

Do our politicians not have children?

With bewilderment that our politicians STILL need to be asked to strengthen their action regarding climate change.

Dimitra Bouzalas

It is obvious to anyone who is serious about climate change that the current government targets are grossly underestimated. 5-15% is nowhere near the amount required to avoid negative/even dangerous climate changes. Back in the '90's scientists thought climate change was happening more slowly. We are now, 2 decades later almost in the 2010's...We actually have very little time to ACT NOW because of the inactivity and miniscule activity of past governments worldwide. We CANNOT WAIT FIVE YEARS..for Arctic Sea Ice to melt entirely.

We SHOULD BE MOVING ON THIS NOW. TODAY. We should not waste a moment. REEXAMINE the CPRS scheme which compensates polluters! We also need to be focusing on 'new growth industries in renewable energy' to help our economy recover.

If we don;t attend to the above issues & make the necessary changes..then industry will increase their emissions accordingly..and nothing will change. Our planet will be doomed.

OK Laugh. think it isn't so..then go study the scientific research of how whole colonies of wildlife are becoming extinct..do we want to wait until humans are extinct also?

Jackie Kane

Dear Senators

I urge senators to get serious, very serious, about what's happening to Earth through global warming. The 5-15% target reduction in greenhouse gases is tokenistic & demonstrates that the government either doesn't understand or, if it does, blatantly doesn't care.

It is critical that the senate not only acts on greenhouse gases but also pressures the government into getting serious about alternative, non polluting energies and environmental restoration to re-establish carbon sinks & increases biodiversity into the bargain.

I also question the value of a carbon trading scheme which seems to give the big polluters free reign to continue on their merry ways while the rest of us are clearing the skies for them to do so.

There need to be taxes on big carbon polluters which might be ameliorated by extra tax breaks if they use alternative, non polluting energies. If they complain about being taxed on their carbon emissions they have only themselves to blame because they've known about this problem for many years but many have done little or nothing about it.

Adrian Watkins

the problem is on the news ewvery day.

Please act with rationality and accept that business as usual is no longer available.

thanks

Michael Dwyer

I object to the current proposed CPR Scheme because I have taken every possible step in my home to minimise carbon emissions but these actions will not have any direct recognition under the CPRS but will instead allow over-compensation of polluters.

The recent ice-bridge collapse indicates clearly that climate change is much more serious than this Scheme acknowledges.

I urge the government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution levels to 1990 levels i.e. by 50% by 2020.

I want to feel proud of what Australia says at Copenhagen after years of shame on this front.

Pat Milthorpe

I am worried that our govts thin the GFC is our biggest problem. It is actually climate change.

UNfortunately the greens don't understand it either. They think it is a matter of individual action making 5% change because I have quick failure folded fluoros instead of cheap energy production incandescents.

Govts need to be taking action taxing carbon at its point of production in Australia or at its arrival without suitable certification.

This tax level can be readily adjusted rather than waiting for the market to play with carbon credits. This taxation can be used to fund developments in non/low-carbon technologies. This includes all the ones you usually list plus CO2 geosequestration and nuclear. There are even new methods of waste disposal being considered. They are all safer than massive climate change.

WE MUST HAVE A CARBON TAX WHICH ALSO APPLIES TO IMPORTS... there is no need to require the Chinese etc to develop carbon reduction strategies, because we can do it for them.

Alan Reynolds

Dear Sir/Madam

The Governments proposal to reduce greenhouse emissions by %5% falls far short of what is required to effectively combat the climate change process that is becoming increasingly more obvious as more scientific studies are published supporting the scope of change the planet is experiencing. As a concerned Australian I believe the Government should take a far stronger stance and commit to more aggressive targets such as reducing emissions by 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels. As a technologically "clever" country much more should be invested in the development of alternative technologies for renewable energy generation which will benefit our economy more in the long term by positioning Australia as a global leader in the field. This will also help set an example to other countries that emit far more greenhouse pollution than us to choose a similar path. Tough choices now will have some short term ramifications, but the longer term benefits outweigh the costs and Australia should demonstrate responsible leadership to the world.

Yours sincerely

Jason Spittle

Dear Senate Inquiry members,

I support the concept of the CPRS and the importance of incorporating a carbon price into economic models as a means of incentivising the economy to adopt a sustainable, positive, low-carbon economy.

Clean coal is an unproven technology. Geosequestration will not commence in the near future as private industry says it is now uneconomical. Encouraging Australians to spend their \$900 bonuses on goods we don't need, goods which won't make us happy, will no doubt fill landfills in our lifetime (causing more greenhouse gases), and doesn't contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions or encourage innovation to reduce emissions, seems to me like a waste of money that future generations will hold us in contempt for.

The CPRS must be simple to administer, encourage renewable energy solutions and innovations, and help transition to a low carbon economy that future generations will be proud of. I fear in its current state it will not achieve this intent.

Make us proud at Copenhagen Mr Rudd.

regards,
glenn

It is now or never - we must make deep cuts in our carbon dioxide emissions now or our inaction will haunt us and the rest of humanity till the end of time.

Australia has so much to lose, if the world does not act to dramatically reduce CO2 emissions, that we must make those deep cuts ourselves and do our best to drag the world along.

Please examine the "Arctic Meltdown" article page 32 of 28 March 2009 edition of New Scientist. The article shows how earth is close to the tipping point where runaway climate change is unavoidable. Also note that if the earth reaches that point then the risk is that the climate change will be sufficient to cause extinction of humans. Bearing that in mind then any short time reduction in economic activity resulting from reducing CO2 emissions is a small price to pay.

You ought know that Australia is the best place in the world for solar energy, we have tremendous geothermal energy potential. Then there is all the wind energy, wave energy and tidal energy potentials. Then there is the energy savings that can be achieved through energy efficiency improvements.

Why are we aiming so low when we we can achieve so much. Are we going to be the Lucky Country with second rate leaders that squandered its opportunities or shall we be a country that rose to the challenge and achieved so much that it's people and leaders could rightly be proud.

Hugh Kelly

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express my dismay at the government's proposed target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The government was elected partly based on its rhetoric about the need for strong action on climate change.

A reduction of 5% is grossly inadequate. Australia has dragged its feet on this issue since Kyoto and a 5% target continues in largely the same vein. The worlds scientists have stated that reductions in the order of 50-60% are necessary to make any real impact on limiting the rise in global temperatures.

It is time for the government to take true leadership on this issue. Many studies conducted over the last 10 years have demonstrated cost effective ways of making significant greenhouse gas emission reductions (well above 5-15%). This also means that businesses should be able to make cost effective savings and should not be compensated as much as is proposed in the CPRS.

I urge the government to reconsider its stated target, and ask this committee to recommend an increased target and corresponding changes to the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

Yours sincerely,
Nicole Workum

Dear Rudd Government

When I voted for the Labour Party I expected MORE COMMITMENT to saving our Planet. 5% is not enough, we have to stop selling our coal deposits (and uranium, that's another can of worms - why should we accept the garbage back from overseas buyers of uranium - NEVER, NEVER, NEVER SELL IT IN THE FIRST PLACE - uranium comes from "SICKNESS COUNTRY" - doesn't that mean an ancient warning?)

Anyway, back to the subject - the people of our GREAT, SPECIAL AND BEAUTIFUL country have to tighten their environmental belts and NEED the SCIENTIFIC and TECHNICAL support of the Government of the day (we expect the Government of the day to be the BRAINS of the current times!).

PLEEEASE increase the Australian Government's commitment to world acceptable %.

I thank you

Carol Lubbers,

The Earth will always right itself. We like every other civilization are merely guests in a much larger ecosystem, geared to destroy anything that threatens it's existence.

Fools talk about this as something that is merely economics, losing jobs that will be obsolete anyway in 10 years time.

Some of your senators talk about it being like the Year 2000 panic.

I work in IT, Y2K was real. But we reacted to the warnings. For 7-10 years beforehand as companies one after the other updated systems, tested newer ones and guess what that created.. A Boom.. They were 10 good years and a large part created the great years of the Howard government as people like me had money to spend on the service industries and houses.

The Green Boom is the next big wave in economics and those who lead the drive will reap the profits... Of course, coal companies don't want to stop making coal. But our goal is not 100% ... Our goal is 50%.... Coal is a finite resource and needed over the long term....taking full profits today is just the short term idiotic thought that got us into the current mess.

We are not trying to stop all production, we are trying to offset production. Outside Broken Hill there is a large plain with winds blowing almost constantly, there is almost constant sunshine. There is a company mainstream that specializes in building wind farms and supergrids (<http://www.mainstreamrp.com/>)

It makes sense for the Coal industry to work in partner of these to make a commitment to replace 50% of their business with renewables. Reducing power does not mean reducing profits... the coal will just last longer making their plants more viable for longer. Do not give them free credits... give them tax relief and credits based on these sort of investments that move their business forward to the future as well. We learned from the banking industry, they are not super intelligent and do not make decisions based on their long term interest.

It makes sense for rural Australia to have wind turbines or small solar grid networks where they are suitable and relatively near a grid line, that supplement their farming income with energy income.. it's a suitable drought proofing mechanism....

Yes the sun only shines in the day but so do most businesses only operated during those hours... selling back and forward to the grid can help most Australians keep their energy costs down. During the day they pass solar to the grid for the extra needed for business use, in the evening wind and coal can take up the slack. Coal can keep the base line, others would supplement the rest.

Allowing industries to follow old practices will not only destroy our planet but stagnate our economy.

Encouraging innovation and our industries to move forward will create not only an economic stimulus here but also product new exportable technologies to ensure Australian's a secure place in the world's workforce, exporting high value goods worldwide.

Regards,
Pauline Bleach

Much stronger action is needed on climate change to have any effect in averting the worst of the predicted consequences of climate change. Current scientific evidence all points to the time-frame within which we can act is being much shorter than previously thought. I urge you to reconsider the structure of the CPR Scheme which currently makes it possible and likely that industry will take up the room under the cap created by individuals taking action to reduce carbon emissions. We need to commit to a 50% reduction in carbon emissions by 2020. We are aware this may have economic consequences, but many of these can be offset by investment in cleaner technology etc. Anyway, there is no economy that will withstand the cost of not acting now.

Regards,
Hilary Bray

Sir,

In essence what we live in is a "closed loop" system, much like a green house and if we fail to live within that system in a way that maintains that system and ensures the stability of that system, we will without doubt upset that system and the more we upset it the worse it will be for us and if we upset it too much, then it would no doubt be fatal.

It is just the same as in a green house in that the proper environment needs to be maintained for a healthy system, the same applies to the big picture as well only if we destroy that much bigger environment which we depend on to sustain our very existence, then we will ultimately destroy our own existence and become extinct, just as the dinosaurs have done, and by our own hand.

Which is something we should be mindful of in considering the reduction that is needed in greenhouse gasses which if we put profits or money first, may end up costing us our very existence and then all the money in the world won't mean anything.

Regards,
Robert McKenzie.

The Secretary

Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

Parliament House

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to express my extreme disappointment and concern at the Government's 5-15% greenhouse emissions policy.

As a Labour voter, I am disgusted at Prime Minister Rudd's betrayal of the public on such a critical issue.

As a mother of young children, I am terrified at the consequences of such a policy for our future generations.

The threat of bushfires, floods, drought and other extreme weather conditions is no longer simply a threat. It has arrived! Unless real action is taken now, what kind of a life will our children have in 50 years time?

I strongly object to the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, where the Big Polluters are being compensated by those of us who are trying to do the right thing by the environment, to the tune of 9 billion dollars over the next three years. In our household, we take great pains to reduce our carbon footprint. We pay extra for green power, pay for water tanks and plumbing, install energy efficient appliances, and walk or ride whenever we can. I find it so depressing to see that these efforts are being thrown back in our faces by the very man we voted for.

There can be no doubt that hard work needs to be done. However, strong action on climate change will create millions of new green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy.

Please restore my faith in Kevin Rudd and set some real targets that will achieve real results for our children's world.

Yours sincerely,

Sally Koster

To whom it may concern,

Our beautiful world is changing dramatically already. Without a drastic reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution we are only adding to the problem instead of being part of the solution.

Our weak targets are undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements. Let's change before we are forced to change or it's too late.

The Artic summer sea ice is disappearing. What effects will there be when it has completely gone? The Antartic is also suffering. Species are threatened as their habitats either disappear or are irreparably changed.

A strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. We are in an ideal position now to embrace and exploit renewable energy ideas and technologies - again before we are forced to.

Industry must be coaxed into making changes now which will benefit all in the future instead of sticking their heads in the sand because for the moment we can still access fossil fuels.

Yours sincerely

L. Clancy

I regard the current Federal government target of 5% as paltry and a poor start.

Add my voice to the calls for a strong and internationally 'cutting edge' target.

Andrew Blanckensee
TAFE teacher
ACT

HI

I want to see Australia lead the world in addressing the problem of climate change. The proposed 2-15% targets are not going to do the job. We need strong action soon if we are to avoid all the costs associated with dealing with runaway climate change.

The CPRS is poorly designed and will act as a disincentive for action by households. I'd like to see this straightened out.

We need a government who will stand strong against the kind of tactics that the big polluters play. Do what is good for Australias long term future not for the short run benefit of a few companies at the expense of the rest.

Regards
Reid McNamara

When Labor was voted in at the last federal election my family and friends were elated, thinking that finally we would have a government that would start taking strong action on global warming.

We have been greatly disappointed by the governments lack of leadership on this issue. Myself and many of the people I know feel you have betrayed the trust we placed on you in this matter. I for one won't be voting labor in the next election.

Peter Baker

Although Australia cannot do it alone, the recent Government targets of 5 - 15% reduction in green house gas's is extremely disappointing. How can we expect developing nations to jump on board if we are not prepared to change our life styles. We need to get serious about Climate change and start embracing sustainable energy. We need to have a carbon pollution reduction scheme in place which will encourage the changes which need to made, with no compensation for the big polluters.

Yours faithfully

Claire Firman

Dear Members of Parliament,

I voted for you with the belief you would do your best to reduce the effects of climate change and pollution to our beautiful Australia and those who live here and visit. I understand that it is a world problem, but we are not doing enough if the targets we set are so low. We need targets of 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution. Incentives need to be put in place for all households, not just businesses. Individuals need to be shown they can make a difference. We need to be leaders for the world in this. I believe we have the ability and the know how already. I hope you do and that you act accordingly.

In trust,

Colleen Mack

Hello,

I'm worried that the Governments current targets will not be enough to avoid dangerous climate change. Such change is happening quicker than we previously thought, even quicker than the most recent IPCC report (which takes a long time to get peer approval).

Whilst I believe that the CPRS is the way to go (because it fits in with international efforts), the CPRS as it stands will not make anywhere near the cuts required (in fact, it is doubtful whether it will have any impact at all with the polluters being compensated and community-minded folk like me having our efforts neutralised).

As a final point, I'd like to see Australia at the forefront of solar and wind research and development (something our country has abundant resources of).

This makes economic and environmental sense that is long sighted, as opposed to our shortsighted support of 'dirty' R&D.

Cheers, Kristan Baker

I am British and though of the same racial background as most Australians have no direct connection to Australia so my views are relatively less important than most of your respondents.

The global situation as regards the danger from greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere means that if humanity is to avoid a runaway greenhouse event which will kill most people on this planet and destroy human civilisation global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced very quickly and substantially.

Some very prosperous nations emit more than 2 tons of carbon per person per annum. Australia emits almost 5 tons and the UK 2.5 tons. Should humanity have any hope of surviving then no nation must emit more than 1.5 tons per head per annum by 2025 at the latest and the global average emissions must be below 0.9 tons per person per annum by 2025.

Australia needs to cut emissions by 70% per person by 2025 which is massive and your governments policies give no chance of this being reached.

I urge your government to look again at the science and plan for much larger reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in Australia than you are planning at present. Should countries like Australia not agree to do much more then the talks in Copenhagen are doomed and it will partly be the fault of your government.

I urge you to tackle this problem with much greater urgency.

All the Best,

Yours Sincerely,

John B Davies.

NB The above views are my own and do not represent the views of Friends of the Earth or anyone else so far as I know.

I am extremely disappointed with the Government's weak target on carbon emissions. Climate change is happening much faster than predicted and urgent action is needed.

The Government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is also patently inadequate because it over-compensates polluters at the expense of consumers and the environment. It would be more accurately described as a scheme to licence big carbon polluters to continue to destroy our planet.

At this time of economic distress, governments throughout the world should embrace the opportunity to stimulate the world economy by spending on infrastructure to help address climate change. Putting small amounts of money into the hands of consumers will have no long-term benefits for the economy and will instead have the detrimental effect of encouraging our unsustainable consumption-based lifestyles.

Without a life-sustaining environment, our economy will not exist or will be irrelevant.

Finally the Government should take notice of the full range of scientific evidence available in developing policy options for addressing climate change. Climatologists in particular have been marginalised by the emphasis on reduction of fossil fuel emissions. The evidence shows that land clearing has contributed 20 times as much as fossil fuel use to the increase in global carbon dioxide.

Ms Shirley Pipitone

Instead of focusing on the short term, think of your kids and the world they are going to live in.

Big business comes and goes but our environment stays around for ever.

Act now to set an example to the world about climate change

Maurice Tae

As an Australian ex-patriot citizen who actively votes in all national and state elections I would like to voice my demand on strong climate action by the Rudd government. I am currently a scientist at the Risø National Laboratory for Sustainable Energy and am actively involved fuel cell and hydrogen production research. Furthermore, after working many years at my institute I have been exposed to the climate change policy of the one of the most ambitious nations in the world, namely Denmark with an average of 18% of its annual electricity produced renewably and with a target of zero carbon emissions by 2050 announced by the prime minister. In comparison the Rudd governments pale ambition of 5% is an embarrassment professionally to me.

Professionally I agree with all of the points raised by the GetUp campaign. Furthermore, I would like to point out that in the long term allowing the major polluters large carbon emissions has no advantage and in fact only disadvantages. Australia is blessed with natural resources, minerals, coal etc, but it also has abundant wind and solar energy sources. If it, in the unlikely event that it becomes apparent that climate change is not an issue, then the coal will still be in the ground and most likely have a greater value than at present after other countries have exhausted their own supplies. Allowing the government to be influenced by large corporations with a short sightedness for economic profit is weak and narrow minded. Why risk extreme weather, crop failures and water shortages for a quick buck today? Introducing strong climate change policy is seen by the leading nations of the world to provide economic and social security and provide the driving force for major technological advances.

With so much at stake, there is no excuse for not doing objective, independent, and quantitative homework including risk analysis regarding the socio-economic effects of climate change.

Jacob Bowen, B.MetE., PhD

I Support stronger 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. This is an opportunity to create Australian jobs

Domestically!

regards

Mark Maddox

Dear Senators

Please commit to a much stronger Carbon Reduction Scheme than the one proposed. I believe a 50% reduction by 2020 (on 1990 levels) is what is needed to make any substantial difference.

Our weak commitment shows we are only making a token effort and do not consider this of any importance.

We need a strong target with a well designed scheme that will help reshape our economy as one committed to renewable energy.

Please change this situation.

Yours sincerely

Rosemary Jacob

No matter how bad this economic recession will get it pales into insignificance when we think of what we are going to experience in our global environment. I cant beleive the procrastination of this government. I voted you in on this platform and I feel betrayed by you all. The carbon Pollution credit system is a joke !! It is just a means of prolonging the situation and allowing industry to get away with its dirty business. You are not stepping up to the mark. My children and my grandchildren will be appalled by the world they have to live in. I am ashamed to say we let it happen.

Rachel Benmayor

I urge the Rudd government to take the similar sort of visionary and exemplary action to reduce Australia's significant contribution to irreversible and catastrophic climate change, as I and so many other Australians were proud to see it take in regard to making a formal apology to the Stolen Generations of first Australians.

If Australia fails to take the lead and commit to strong reduction targets (such as 40-50 %, as suggested by the world's top climate scientists), it will be too late and very unlikely that the international community can forge a strong response as a whole. We must see this volatile and frightening economic and environmental crisis as an opportunity to forge new responses by embracing and developing sustainable technology. By becoming a world leader in research and development of clean technologies and in making the change from a fossil fuel based economy to a renewables one; we will reap immense economic benefit and thereby safeguard our economic prosperity as well as our well being for future generations.

Please take the courage and ingenuity of the Australian population as a measure of our potential and an encouragement, and act now without being coerced by the inertia of industrial capitalism and all its destructive woes. Thankyou for taking the time to consider my input. I eagerly anticipate seeing the leadership and vision that I expect from a government that has Peter Garrett himself as minister for Environment and Indigenous affairs.

The Great South Land Can Be As Great As The One It Could Have Been!!!

Say YES to a Real Life Ambition! Say Yes! to our Hopes and Our Plans. Forget about your Indecision!
Let's get the Industrial Climate Disaster Off Our Land!

Yours Sincerely, Brendan Ward.

To: Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy
Exposure Draft of the CPRS Legislation

I am writing from the Daylesford area in the scenic highlands of central Victoria, where in February we narrowly escaped a bushfire that could have wreaked havoc on our community, but fortunately, did not. Of course, communities such as Kinglake, Marysville, Churchill, etc. were not so lucky in the earlier Black Saturday killer fires. I strongly believe that these terrible bushfires are a DIRECT RESULT of CLIMATE CHANGE / GLOBAL WARMING. Although the Rudd government has acknowledged that climate change is indeed a real and present danger, the extremely weak targets announced last December - basically a 5% reduction in carbon pollution by 2020 - are really a joke, considering the gravity of the problem faced by this nation.

If we look to science for guidance and answers, a steady stream of new data demonstrates that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously believed. Australia's announced weak targets are undermining efforts to form international agreements. These targets must be upgraded before the meeting of the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen next December. The CPRS currently proposed by PM Rudd and Climate Change Minister Wong is so badly designed that it will do more harm than good. Specifically, the CPRS contains major loopholes for the big polluters (such as their right to purchase offshore carbon credits in an effort to avoid actually cutting their carbon emissions at home), which are quite shocking, and in fact destroy what should be the intent of the legislation, which is to encourage polluters to reduce their carbon footprints. Also, the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, a quite absurd, ridiculous, even outrageous loophole

which is designed so that Australia's total greenhouse emissions cannot reduce below the weak 5% target.

In summary, I urge that the Senate committees examine these loopholes and flaws of the CPRS in their inquiries.

Sincerely yours,

Zachary Casper
Glenlyon, Victoria

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my intense concern about the current government policy on climate change. The targets established for reducing greenhouse emissions are extremely inadequate and need to be reviewed immediately. Climate science is no longer in question, the quickly mounting evidence is strong and globally accepted, and displays a frightening future.

As an environmental educator, I am exposed to these figures on a daily basis. Trying to remain positive about our options and communicate that to the community is an increasingly difficult task in light of federal government actions. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is little more than a mask for this country being unwilling to commit to serious change. Change which is absolutely vital if we are to survive in any capacity - environmental, economical and social. We need now, more than ever, strong leadership to progress us with a real target (of at least 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020) and a system that will allow us to achieve that. CPRS will not. In fact by its very nature, it will block us from achieving any more than the paltry 15% maximum we have set.

I urge our government to take the lead of the many other countries (including the US who have recently made a significantly more proactive commitment) and prioritise this issue to where it should be. On the top of the pile. We need to be part of a very quick international response to this. Our futures are literally in your hands.

Yours Faithfully,

Rose Childe

The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme legislation falls far, far short of what Australia must do if climate disaster is to be averted. The science is unequivocal on the need to at least halve all greenhouse emissions within the next decade.

I am deeply disappointed in the Rudd government for failing to deliver the revolution in climate policy that I voted for at the polls. Please, please, please, do not sacrifice our children's future for the sake of the present entrenched interests in a climate-hostile economy.

To reform the proposed scheme, I suggest replacing carbon emission targets with a simple tax on greenhouse emissions (carbon and nitrogen), ramped up on a published schedule to give business and government time to adapt, albeit at an uncomfortably brisk pace. The revolution in the Australian energy sector will pay off in the middle term by placing Australia in the vanguard of climate technology and policy development, and of course pay off in the long term if Australia's bold lead helps stimulate the rest of the world to follow suit.

Regards,
Andrew Bettison

Dear Sir/Madam,

I was appalled when your government annouced you were only going to have 5-15% climate change targets. I am a strong labour supporter and was extremely dissappointed in us as a nation for not taking a leading role in stopping climate change. We are on one income and have a growing family, can find the money and will to become 'greener' (ie am up to 50% green power, and soon will jiggle our budget to get 100%, and have made my house as energy effiecent as possible), surely this government can set an example for the world to aspire to,

as we work together to fix this problem. I pray for wisdom as you all seek to find the best solutions to climate change and hope you will set high taregts like 50% by 2020.

Thank you for your time.

regards,

Michelle Carraro

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to raise my concerns on the Government's targets of between 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution in the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS). From what I understand, these targets are too low in relation to the rapidly increasing climate change.

I would like to see more emphasis put on reducing pollution from major industry. It seems that a lot of the emphasis has been placed on household emissions and whilst this is necessary, there doesn't seem to be enough focus on the amount of pollution or significant plans to reduce emissions from industry. I would also like to see highre targets set.

Kind regards,

Aaron Ryan

To whom it may concern,

I strongly support a reduction in Australia's greenhouse emissions of 50% by 2020 rather than the currently proposed target. A 50% reduction would be in keeping with current research that demonstrates a faster than previously anticipated rate of climate change. My belief is that doing this would have several effects: (i) a valuable reduction in Australia's own carbon dioxide emissions, (ii) setting a strong international example, (iii) start the ball rolling towards development of renewable energy sources which will have to be increasingly relied upon irrespective of climate change.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. David R. Ireland,

I support any effort to improve this government's disappointing response to global warming.

Emissions could easily be reduced, and the need for future power stations obviated if domestic consumption were reduced. This could be achieved simply by installing solar panels on every roof in the country.

The fact that the government ignores the blindingly obvious and goes for the heavy engineering project makes it perfectly clear that they are still trying to put work in the way of big oil and coal companies.

For a Labour government, this is very disappointing.

regards, Gwynedd Duncan-Jones

I write to ask the Government to do something real and meaningful with regard action on climate change. The Government's target of reducing greenhouse emissions by 5-15% is simply not adequate. We should 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 the important UN Conference on Climate Change in December.

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

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which submissions 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 the cap.

One of the reasons I voted for the current Government was because I thought we finally had a chance of bringing about real action on climate change. I believed we could be world leaders in this, and even refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

I believe it is crucial the Government set a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, to ensure the future is sustainable for all.

Please do something to make a difference now, before it is too late.

Michelle Mylius

I am appalled at the weak response that the government is proposing to address climate change. Excuses are loss of jobs in some industries and impact on the economy in already difficult circumstances. It is clear from the scientific literature that we will be lucky to avoid major loss of the natural environment upon which ultimately our economy, jobs and very survival depends.

John van Leeuwen

I wish to object to the totally inadequate target set by the Government. We should be committing to targets of 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

It is becoming clear from the latest scientific data that the effects of climate change are occurring more quickly than initially predicted meanwhile emissions continue to grow.

I would like to see my government take a much stronger target to Copenhagen in December

I am also concerned that the proposed CPRS appears to compensate polluters at the expense of the environment.

I hope these concerns are addressed by the Senate enquiry,

Yours faithfully

Patsy Brown

I would like to strongly voice my encouragement to the government to commit us as a country to a much braver set of climate change targets. I believe we should set an example we can all be proud of and aim to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020, as compared with 1990 levels. The current proposed target undermines the confidence of the people of Australia in the government's ability to handle this crisis and our ability to ensure real forward momentum and change at the UN conference on Climate change in Copenhagen.

I believe this target is achievable, and that Australians are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to ensure a future for the future generations. I am not blinded by the GFC, I believe that Climate Change is a much bigger crisis, that will be longer lasting and have greater effect. The economies required to alter our position on climate change targets will give us the opportunity to tap currently underutilised resources in renewable energy and green trades.

I am especially disappointed in the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme which over compensates the largest polluters at the expense of the community and environment, a situation that is simply unacceptable. The CPRS also fails to give ordinary Australians the power and impetus to make their own changes which will then in turn add to Australia's reduction in Greenhouse gas emissions.

Please reconsider the proposed targets, Australians are more brave than the current plan gives credit for.

Yours sincerely
Louise Sensi RN

The Rudd Government received a mandate for strong climate change action that has not materialised. It falls then to other parties to have the courage of climate change conviction. All of our other good efforts in managing the environment, our economy, and our societies will be undermined by failing to cut emissions and effectively plan for those changes already underway. I urge you to take whatever steps are necessary to safeguard our future - Australia needs to be a leader on this, for our own benefit and the world's. Thank you.

Stuart Brownlea

To whom it might concern,

As this ongoing climate change does concern us all.

I am aware that the due by date to lodge concerns to the senate has passed, my apologies for the late e-mail, I have only just now come upon this sight and felt the need to mention this....

"You can not fix a problem with the same thinking that created it."

I implore all senators to listen with open minds and full hearts to all the information that they are presented with, and in the words of a wise man and fellow Politician Al Gore " this is a problem!

In times gone past, a tribe of native American Indians would sit in council and decide the actions their communities would take for their future and survival. In deciding which and what actions they would take, great consideration was given to what impact said actions would have on not less than seven generations that followed. And they were considered savages?

We as humans possess a great ability to to live by design when we are not gripped in fear, change can sometimes be fearful yes however, "If we always do what we have always done, we will always get what we have always got".

Don't buy into the myth of big business that, jobs will be lost! we cannot afford! or, Climate change, it's a natural phenomenon!

Be honest with yourselves look around, remember your youth, remember squealing as a child with the delight of an icy cold spray of water on your hot skin as you frolicked under the sprinkler on your front lawn. A lawn which was lush and green under your bare feet. How you sheltered under an ageless tree for refreshing, reviving shade while picnicking on vegemite sandwiches and drank home made lemonade made from home grown lemons.

How many of our children can indulge in such simple and basic pleasures?

We as Australians have the tenacity and problem solving abilities to take this challenge and make GREAT things happen, we just need the courage of our leaders to see the bigger picture to vote for sustainability with creativity and know there are many, many good people ready to do what needs to be done.

In closing I would like to thank you for your service to our great nation, and trust that you will follow your conscience when voting on this, one of the most important decisions you will ever make.

With great respect and gratitude,
Jodie Lea Cleave

As I write this solar panels are going up on my roof. This is a wonderful thing, but I am disheartened by the fact that my reduction in pollution will be an advantage to someone else who wishes to pollute.

Australians want stronger targets to feel that we are doing something to reduce the terrifying effects of climate change. We have all been horrified by the unprecedented damage of bush fires and devastating floods in the last few months in our country alone.

We cannot delay, the level of reduction needs to be raised to 50% by 2020.

Yours sincerely,
Kate Swadling

Dear Sir/Madam

I urge to take much more decisive action to reduce green house gases, to aim for a 5% reduction is a joke. We as one of the first world and leading nations should take a much larger stance because we can and also because we have been one of the places that have greatly benefitted from all the action that have lead to the current situation.

We should aim at a reduction as close as possible to the 1990 levels.

All science is pointing to much faster growth of green house problems than previously thought. We owe it to our children, our country and the world to take decisive action.

Australia wants to be seen in with the world top 20 nation, as a leader, that means we need to act as one.

I also urge you improve the current scheme which is a joke in its current forms and does very little to lead to any real reductions by the real polluters. As a minimum remove the floor of emission reductions, so we can achieve real and larger reduction.

If Australia does not join that movement we will lose out in crucial new growth industries and schemes. Thank you for considering these views.

Heike Raunow

Thank you for considering

To all political parties interested in real climate change policies.

I am very concerned about the present government's lack of commitment to climate change.

WE need a target of 50 % reduction in greenhouse pollution if we are going to help reduce the impact of global warming.

We are confronted daily with the effects of climate change. The melting of the Wilkins Ice Bridge is the most recent catastrophe.

A continuous stream of new scientific findings indicate that climate change is happening faster than was previously believed. It is now believed that the Arctic summer sea ice will be gone within the next 5 years. The impact of that will be experienced world wide with rising sea levels, extinction of fauna, etc.

Come on Australia. Be a leader in Climate Change Policy. Make an impact.

N. Lamir

I am very concerned that the government is allowing polluters more leeway to continue to pollute. I am concerned that my RECS will be used to allow industry to pollute.

THE CARBON POLLUTION REDUCTION Scheme is compensating polluters at the expense of the environment and community.

The Australian government needs to set strong targets with a well-designed scheme in order to avoid dangerous climate change. This will help our country so that our economy can take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Could Australia lead the way in climate change policy. One country has to do this why not Australia, lead by example.

I want Australia to commit to reducing our Greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

These weak targets are just a token gesture, we have had the good times and now we must pay for our destruction. We have no right to leave the heavy toll to other generations. We must make a larger target our priority before December and the UN Conference in Copenhagen.

We must set a strong target with a well-designed CPRS scheme, this will create new jobs in the renewable energy field.

We cannot take the risk of doing only a small thing, look at the number of civilizations that have disappeared because of lack of water and Australia is heading down that track.

Yours faithfully

Sandra Hand

We have dillydallied around with cutting our carbon pollution output too long. Setting weak emissions reduction targets helps noone. What faces us and our children and grandchildren if we don't take decisive action now is terrifying. Mr Rudd, stand up, be a strong leader. Take the initiative and show the rest of the world what needs to be done to save this planet. You must know that the CPRS you are proposing is seriously flawed. Paying companies to pollute is ludicrous. Please, for the sake of us all, be the strong leader Australia, and indeed the world, needs right now.

Thank you for your time.

Your sincerely,

Alicia Kaylock

The Government's miserley 5 - 15 % target on emissions reduction is not adequate to protect our nation's interests nor the world's environmental qualms. We should be leading the world in greenhouse gas reduction and should commit to reducing pollution by 50% by 2020.

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 inclusion of the protection of existing forest must also be included in an emissions reduction scheme.

Please please please - represent my interests and raise the target for emissions reduction.

Yours sincerely,
Sophia Walter.

I am appalled by the weak carbon reduction target that has been set, particularly in light of recent events in the Arctic where an ice bridge has collapsed. It is totally unacceptable that future generations should pay while we continue our hedonistic lifestyles. I am particularly upset by the fact that the savings I have made by purchasing Green Energy and using public transport will be taken advantage of by industrial polluters because they will go to the overall target. I had a lot of confidence in the Rudd Government and Penny Wong, but they have sold out to industrial polluters.

David Farrier

Dear Senators

I am extremely concerned about the inadequacy of the Government's proposed climate change measures. Recent scientific evidence tells us that climate change is occurring even faster than previously predicted. Since unchecked climate change threatens the survival of human civilisation (a scientifically based assertion), urgent measures to counter it are necessary. The emission targets proposed by the Government are far from adequate to counter climate change. Further, the Government's CPRS is so badly designed that it over-compensates big polluters at the expense of individuals trying to reduce their own emissions.

Australia should take up the challenge President Obama has set for the US to become a clean green economy. We need to show a commitment to undertake significant measures ourselves and so be able to call upon the rest of the international community to do likewise.

The window of opportunity to address climate change is narrowing. We Australians must seize the day and not fail future generations by refusing to take actions that will go beyond gesture and actually make a difference.

your most sincerely
Vivien Holmes

Climate change is happening, and we need to try and reduce our emissions by more than the 5-15% target.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

This is a time to make difficult decisions about the kind of lifestyles we need to adapt to in order to sustain life in our country and on our planet. The government needs to set a good example.

Thank you,
Michelle Ferguson

Already we are seeing scientific findings that show that climate change is happening more quickly than previously predicted. The thaw in the Arctic sea summer ice should illustrate how urgent it is to set ambitious targets. Our Australian government has just shown it's prepared to lead the way in technological innovation with its plan for state of the art broadband. Our industries could also lead the way in the using renewable energies if they were given incentives through ambitious climate change targets. I urge all parliamentarians to support strong climate change action now.
Barbara Reynolds

Dear Members of the Inquiry in the Government's Climate Change policy,

Australia's stance on emissions reduction is looking ever more tenuous, weak and inadequate in view of the steadily mounting scientific evidence of more-rapid-than-expected climate change. Australia has in some eras and on some topics been a leader in environmental awareness and conservation, and our current approach leaves me ashamed to be Australian. Projections for full melt of the Arctic sea ice only a few short years ago were on the order of several decades - projections now are around five years. We can not stand by with our current lily-livered stance saying, to all intents and purposes "we might do something if others do something, but we really don't want to stop digging up coal." We need to bite the bullet and commit to targets of carbon pollution reduction by 50% on 1990 levels by 2020. Only with such dramatic and difficult cuts can we hope to plunge much of the world into chaos, with the poor and the poor nations inevitably bearing the brunt of our own self-indulgence.

We need to accept that the world has changed, our old industry stalwarts will not serve us well in the years ahead, and it is time to move on and make the best of the new economy. This includes setting strong targets, ensuring pollution actually carries a cost (not over-compensating the big polluters, which will ensure they have no incentive to reduce emissions), and refocussing on low emission and renewable energy. Note also that nuclear power is currently not at all a low emissions source of energy, given the energy required to dig fuels out of the ground, prepare and transport them.

Regards,
Dr Rosie Cooney

Dear Sir/ Madam,

The current version of the CPRS is bad for Australia and bad for the world.
Please take action now to change it!

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).

A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

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

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 extremely unfair and makes a mockery of the attempts of individuals to reduce their impact on the environment.

Thank you,
alison haines

Like all emergencies we need not panic. We need planned action, decisive action and effective action.

If you accept the science on climate change, ... and you accept the predictions from that science, ... then the choice is obvious that we need to treat this like a climate invasion that will kill the reef, destroy a large proportion of our farming ability, cause catastrophic fires, droughts and floods. If you do not accept the science and the predictions, then you need substantial proof for why it is not a problem, considering the dire consequences.

If this was a foreign invader threatening this, we would already be on a World War footing and contributing 30% of our GDP fighting it. This climate emergency is even worse than a World War and yet we play around the edges. We must take the science seriously and take dramatic and serious action now. The proposed level of the CPRS scheme can only be described as pathetic compared to what is needed.

This is now a moral issue and our politicians lack of serious action will condemn the world. Our politicians rightly say those fire bugs in Victoria were mass murders, ... what then are the politicians who know and understand that there lack of action will result in 100's of millions being condemned? Why are they not also guilty of mass murder on a much greater scale?

Yours sincerely,
David Grice

TO the government of the day, please note our household is astonished that you could set the target of %5-%15 for the reduction of greenhouse gas pollution.

How many more governments are going to misrepresent the views of mainstream Australia for political points with power brokers, unions, business and foreign countries.

The members of our house want to see greater funds spent on renewable energy and on cleaning up our environment.

You so easily spend \$5million to look for sunken ships in the pacific. This is one example in a hundred of your government spending big on political point scoring and media management. Here's a news flash, why not be productive about planning a sustainable future for all Australians.

The two major parties of Australia, like the four major banks, have a significant commercial advantage over the population of this nation, we ask that you benefit the people, that incidently will have to live with the repercussions of your cognitive dissonance, by planning a robust sustainable and healthy future.

Please enough of your greenwash. It is time for action.

A seperate message to Peter Garrat, I was a massive Midnight Oil fan, but take note mate, your inability to gain ecological benefits on a grand scale for the Australian environment and its people is making you the biggest hypocrit. Use your balls and start speaking out.

Regards

Peter McBride
Kirrilie Phillips
Zoe McBride

Dear Kevin and CO

I and thousands of others voted for you in 07 because you stood out above the Liberals on your plans for improving our carbon footprint. Now you have made a laughing stock of those same people that gave you their support and vote.

Remember this, I did not vote for you because of your impecable ability to manage our economy or manage our industrial relations (the liberals have prooven to be better at that than you) I voted for you because you said you were going to make a change to our emmisions. 5% is not good enough mate. You only have 2 years to convince me that I should give you my next vote and right now you have not got it.

Roger

It is imperative the targets for greenhouse are raised to levels that are going to REDUCE the planet overheating. 5-15% is just not a 'sustainable' target. Why not aim high to drive real change in behaviours and innovation?

The recent scientific findings about the rate of change of our planet has shown clearly that the situation is worse than predicted even 2 years ago. This must be kept in mind when resetting the targets.

Increasing target levels will also encourage a stronger international response at the next UN Conference on this subject in December.

CPRS does not target the key polluters in our economy - these businesses must be pushed into changing, not compensated for their bad behaviours. The idea of carbon trading/credits has been instituted to drive innovation. Over compensating polluters negates this.

We need real direction from your response to this global issue. Targetted spending on driving innovation and encouraging companies focussed on creating sustainable alternatives to current polluting technologies and usage should be the focus.

I hope you can work your way through the issues and economics of this to make policy that can help our planet in a real and effective way.

Stefan van Amerongen

9/4/2009

Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Change,

Please help

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.

Cold water is more highly oxygenated than warm water, infact, warm water holds little oxygen at all.

Also, the presence of ice and cold water leads to currents which in turn oxygenate water.

Global warming will lead to stagnant dead seas with no life.

Please help.....Alison Mcdonald (BSc)

Australia needs to take a stronger stance on climate change, and needs to do it quickly. The Government's current 5-15% target is completely inadequate if we want to seriously tackle this issue. Please understand that the effects of climate change are happening very quickly, and we do not have time to waste!

Australia should be taking the lead in setting a strong target and taking advantage of our natural environment by investing in renewable energy - the only long term solution to climate change and dwindling fossil fuel resources.

Please tackle the issues that truly matter!

Melanie Jeffery

Please get real with your Climate Policy and recognise the importance of committing Australia to reduce greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (this estimate based on 1990! levels). Our present weak target is undermining sincere efforts to form crucial international agreement at UN Conference in December.

Our present scheme serves only to over-compensate polluters at the expense of the community, the environment and the planet as a whole. Already new scientific information is revealing that climate change is escalating at a far more rapid rate than previously anticipated. NOW is the time to act. What good are our profits when there is no world in which to operate ?

Please act now.

Yours sincerely,

Lucia Dale.

To whom it may concern,

With Obama in the White House providing strong and moral leadership in the matter of climate change it time to revisit where Australia will position itself on environmental issues. Australia is a leader in the Pacific. We need to commit to a much more ambitious target than the current one set by this government.

Thank you

Carmel Montgomery

We need to commit to a 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution (on 1990 levels) by 2020 to avoid dangerous climate change.

We need to support efforts to reach international agreement.

There is no longer any room for queries regarding the severity of climate change, which is already evidenced and is progressing at a faster rate than previously expected.

The CPRS is ridiculous over compensating polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. Industries need to either clean up or be resigned to history. It has to happen sometime- it might as well happen now while we still have a chance to avoid irreversible change.

There should not be a floor to the CRPS for emission values, so that individuals' and small businesses' reductions in energy use contribute to Australias reductions in emissions. It is incredibly unpalatable that the savings we make are then just used up by industrial polluters. It is the most unpalatable part of the entire scheme. It leaves the public wondering why they should make sacrifices and efforts if it just helps out industry's profits?

Thanks for reading

I'll look forward to the Rudd Government showing us why we put our faith in then.

Kind regards,

Shayna Gavin

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I am extremely concerned about the poor target you have set for reducing greenhouse pollution. You are acting as if the most important thing is to avoid confronting people -- especially business. Yet polling shows that the average person is very fearful of what we are leaving our children, and is very willing to shoulder the cost of change.

You are not doing enough to reward businesses and individuals who commit to significant reductions. There is nothing more important than setting effective long-and short-term targets (and relevant strategies for achieving same.) This short-term thinking must stop. You must do the job we elect you to do, which is to manage our society for the long-term good of all.

Sincerely,

Margaret Ryan

Prime Minister,

I was one of the many who voted for you because you promised to get this country moving on ameliorating dangerous climate change. Please live up to that promise.

You enjoy having a large profile on the international stage - use it, commit Australia to a 50% reduction by 2020 out there where the world can see it and see what needs doing globally. Please, please, for our children's and their children's sake, take a stand here.

Rasa Dunlop

As a member of the Australian public I wish to voice my opinion and state that a 5% reduction in greenhouse gasses is unacceptable. Australia should be leading the way and make reductions of 50% by 2020. In doing this it would encourage green business now in anticipation and aid in the formation of strong international agreements on climate change.

As Aussies we all love the environment, lets show that we care.

S Norton

The 5-15% target is totally inadequate; we need 50%! This undermines global action and local sustainable industries.

The CPRS is pathetic! It will actually do more harm than good and take away ordinary people's ability to make a difference while also rewarding polluters for doing more polluting.

We really need you to do something truly brave and effective, so please take a real stand!

Mary-Jo O'Rourke

Dear Prime Minister Rudd,

I am a very concerned mother of two young children. Like many Australians I was overjoyed at your election as Prime Minister. However the 5-15% target to reduce green house emissions is completely inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Please do not let the children of Australia down. I believe that you are a compassionate and intelligent man, please show true international leadership on this issue.

Australia needs to be a world leader on these issues. The next generations are counting on you!

Kind Regards

Michelle Lowe

Please, please stop pussy-footing around greenhouse gas emissions. Right now the planet appears to be tracking the worst case projections of the IPCC, so anything less than deep, deep cuts into greenhouse gas emission would be foolhardy beyond comprehension. It's a risk management no-brainer.

And since we need immediate results, please stop relying on carbon capture and nuclear power to save us - neither can be delivered in the time frames needed and both have substantial problems. Immediate measures like gas, wind, and solar make so much more sense. Tragically we've put so little investment into solar over the last 30 years. Now it's essential we redress that imbalance.

Sincerely,

Geoff Callender

I am not a green activist but an ordinary Australian concerned about climate change. Having read what scientists say is required regarding greenhouse reduction targets, and the general expectations after the recent election of the Rudd government, I was shocked when, after all its studies, the government grandly announced a target of 5% reduction. From what I could understand, this would achieve absolutely nothing in terms of arresting greenhouse gas emission and the terrible affects of climate change. It is misleading, and probably destructive, if the 5% target generates any sense that this rich country is actually doing something effective. Why doesn't the government stand up to the coal industry? Let Mr Rudd match its rhetoric of a new start, and creative solutions, and actually make a very very serious commitment to greenhouse reduction. Create 21st century industries, and make Australia a REAL leader in the world.

Regards, David Moloney

Dear Government, You have not dealt with this problem at all. Rather, you have given us the usual spin, and have avoided dealing with this coming catastrophe by handing the problem over to your friends in the corporate sector to make some more money out of. You have failed to act on behalf of the people once more. Money, money money. You , in majority, are irresponsible fools. We deserve and need better. Anyhow, why bother. Unless there is a radical change, the world is headed for doom.

Regards, Bill Martin

Please listen to all the concerns you are getting about action about climate change before it tis too late!

Tanya Burrows

Please push Rudd Garrett and Wong to a 30% minimum reduction in Australia's greenhouse pollution by 2020 (on 1990 levels), and a more stringent CPRS with heavier penalties and less compensation / exception.

This can be simply achieved by mandating more renewable energy and less fossil fuel usage, and seriously considering nuclear, and penalising ALL heavy emitters no matter the industry.

Renewables and nuclear are not uneconomic, many recent figures indicate end-to-end costs for them are comparable or even favourable with coal.

Do not pay heed to the vested interests - the only uneconomic aspect of biasing to renewables is to the incumbent fossil fuel industry and since we are going to be reliant on them for at least another generation they'll still be profitable, just a bit less - but the move to a cleaner environment has to start today !

Chris Cunningham, Forestville.

I could have sworn that last election, one party contesting was the great Australian Labor Party, Protector of the Weak, Champion of the Oppressed, Supporter of Truth over Misinformation and that rare beast, a Political Party capable of acting for the Common Good.

Who the hell are you weirdos who are in power now? What kind of misinformation are you reading that suggests that such a pathetic target for greenhouse gas reduction, wrapped up in such a ludicrous scheme, will do any good at all? (Other than for the polluting big businesses, that is) Given that the latest research suggests that global warming is happening faster than ever before, and faster than predicted, and will affect Australia first and hardest among the industrialised countries, how can we hide our heads in the sand and set a useless example to everyone else? It is *us, the Australian people* who will be worst off when it all goes pear-shaped, and how dare you betray our trust after your promises and rhetoric at the last election?

I thought you were the great Australian Labor Party, Protector of the Weak, Champion of the Oppressed, Supporter of Truth over Misinformation and that rare beast, a Political Party capable of acting for the Common Good. I thought that you were as horrified as I was about John Howard's "non-core promises". Do I now refer to you as the late Australian Labor Party?

Aleksander Pusz, appalled

Dear Government,

It is time for the government to make individual people as well as heads of industries to take responsibility for climate change. Any inconvenience or loss we will get used to, an irreparable damage to the environment we will not be able to get used to.

Truly yours,

Natalia Rojas

To Whom It May Concern,

Over the last 100 years we have led the world in science, sport, warfare and conservation and lots more. Please don't let some other country overtake our leadership and innovation by only demanding 5% reductions of greenhouse emissions. The earth needs Australia to set the example and lead the world into an era not only of peace between nations, but peace between man and nature.

The earth provides life, we should do everything we can to protect it.
Respectfully,

Blaine Campbell

I am extremely disappointed at the Government's half-baked efforts to combat climate change. With the Arctic and Antarctic ice melting at an alarming rate, with many Australian species of flora and fauna vanishing, with the Murray River a basket case, I find it hard to believe that the best the Government can come up with is a pathetic 5-15% target for reducing our pollution levels.

Refuse to be intimidated by the big polluters and ensure that we all work together towards preventing further climate change.

Save the Planet!

Sue Mann

Dear Sir/Madam

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).

Sincerely

Cameron Gaffney

First, please let me thank you for giving ordinary concerned citizens the opportunity to make submissions on the Rudd govt climate change policy. I do not believe that the govt has taken sufficient account of the groundswell of popular feeling on this issue, and in this respect it follows directly in the footsteps of the failed Howard govt whose unconscionable petty politicking and 'fiddling while Rome burned' threw away the best chance we had of saving the Murray-Darling basin.

I am very angry with both major political parties over this issue, and it has caused me to change my votes at all levels to the Greens.

In regard to climate change policy, and especially the pathetic CPRS, I want to lodge a very strong protest against the govt's watering down of its firm pre-election commitment to do something real in regard to carbon emissions and climate change. Allowing major polluters to continue their destructive practices virtually unchecked (indeed, awarding them a fistful of free pollution certificates to help them on their way), is utterly abhorrent to me and my family. We do not believe it is beyond the wit of committed and intelligent people -- should they actually want to do so -- to devise a system with real targets and with enough built-in flexibility to allow for increasing reductions should the consensus of scientific opinion (and observable scientific data) indicate that greater measures are urgently needed. How dare a transient govt seek to lock the people of this country into an inflexible system that delivers almost nothing in real terms and allows for an expanding quantum o

f industrial pollution that will act as a disincentive for research and development into real measures for green house gas reduction (not the 'pie in the sky' illusion of Queensland politics, "clean coal".) It seems little more than a squalid PR exercise, as is supported by its single focus on carbon reduction when scientific evidence indicates that it is a range of greenhouse gas emissions that need to be brought under control, not simply carbon.

Thank you.

Nola Cooke

Dear policy makers,

I'm very worried about the effect of climate change on the planet, especially in the light of the recent news of accelerated ice cap melting in Antarctica and the Arctic. It seems to be happening much faster than anyone thought, which means we have to act decisively and quickly.

Australia needs to make more effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. 5-15% is not enough to make a difference.

We need to make the painful step of moving away from reliance on fossil fuels - despite our rich coal resources -and become a global leader in renewable energy.

In regard to the CPRS, I am disgusted that if I personally reduce my emissions and that of my household, it will only allow industry to emit more. It makes one question, what is the point? I want to do something, and it's very frustrating to feel that your efforts do not make a difference.

Please reconsider the CPRS and set higher targets. In regard to the economic implications of higher targets, well, there will be no economy left to protect if global warming gets a hold.

thank you

Jessica McGowan

Please give us real targets for climate change. It is so disappointing being fobbed off like this. We are all doing our bit but we need much more leadership for the real structural change that is needed
Get on with it now please
Marg Lange

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

We need to set a strong target with a well-planned scheme to ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. Also to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy would do wonders for the economy.

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

Sincerely concerned,

Anna Meadows

Dear Mr. Rudd,

I am very concerned about the apparent escalation of the effects of climate change which seems to be increasing worldwide. The 5% reduction which your government is aiming at seems woeful with the world situation and I wish to have my voice heard. There seem to be an increasing range of catastrophic events occurring and of course there may well be more than one reason for these events, however human effects must be part of that. We cannot keep expecting the earth to put up with our ignorance and must act now to prevent the march of these events. Australia has such a great opportunity to be at the forefront of all the new technology increasingly becoming available, in the long term it seems that this would be a wise approach to adopt to get in the driver's seat providing well needed jobs in sustainable industry.

I do hope sense prevails and that you take up the opportunity on behalf of all Australians to be innovative and wise.

Best wishes.

Kate Taylor

Dear Senators,

I urge you to increase Australia's commitment to reducing our carbon pollution by increasing our target to a 50% reduction on 1990 levels.

Now is the time to take a strong stand on climate change and reposition our economy to take advantage of developments in renewable energy. Use the global financial crisis as a launch pad for building infrastructure which serves the community into the future of diminished resources and changed environmental conditions.

Australians want strong leadership, not afraid to make the tough decisions necessary to move our nation towards a truly sustainable future.

We have trusted you as our representatives, so please take the courageous road rather than the easy middle path.

Sincerely,

Petrina Hutchinson

The economic crisis has pushed the issue of climate change to the background of the current government's agenda, even though Kevin Rudd declared the issue the defining one of our time.

We will be judged by how we act now and the next 2 to 3 years. This is not the time for talk, but for action. The proposed 5-15% target is weak, and not what a leading Western nation should attempt to achieve. We need to set an example, not be a follower.

A carbon tax will achieve much more than that of the proposed CPRS. We need to put up deterrents to carbon emitters, not get-out clauses. Each and every individual is doing their best to achieve cuts in their own lifestyle, why let the big polluters get away with it?

Please Mr Rudd, this is your chance to be a LEADER. Look at the response to Obama in the US - this is largely because he is a man who is DOING, not just talking. You rode to power on the back of climate change - time to follow through with some promises. My children and yours will thank you for it.

Stacie Bobele

The Government's 5-15% target is not enough. It allows business as usual instead of encouraging creative thinking as to how business can change to remain viable & protect the environment.

Also the design of the CPRS needs changing. Although I understand that we need to save business, when they are over compensated they are not motivated to change, which they must do. They can still keep putting it off. As well, the cuts that individuals & small business make to reduce greenhouse gases just allow big business to increase their emissions. The scheme needs to make big business accountable for their cuts irrespective of what the rest of the community can do.

I am a grandmother and I think it is our duty to make sure that we leave the world a better place for future generations.

Sallie Quarles

I demand strong action on climate change. A 5% greenhouse reduction target isn't good enough to stop dangerous climate change. This timid move is something I would expect from the Coalition, but not from a Government that was elected on a platform of taking serious action on climate change. I, like many other Australians and people concerned all over the world demand more!

Kind regards
Kirsty

I am greatly concerned that our Federal Government (present & past) is doing so little re the above.

I believe that carbon credits is a cover up bandaid, merely allowing top end business to continue polluting at almost the same levels by purchase or transfer of carbon credits from other areas of business not polluting.

This is yet another smokescreen to allow for continuing bad behaviours on our planet in the pursuit of profits as the major objective by major polluters.

Similarly we see the false evidences re climate change where long term information is avoided & real scientific data ignored for computer model examples.

This to justify the science to maintain their current funding ,supporting false premiss behaviours that maintain their wrong theories but keep them employed & their egos intact as the truths would make their many years of false doctrines make them appear foolish.

We are not all sponges out here that soak up all the media & political hype & lies & mostly in the pursuit of monetary rewards programs.

It is a pity those in high places do not seek out truths as we, now quite well educated public do.

G.Matthew Norman

We need to get serious about climate change and this proposed piece of legislation is not serious enough. We often forget that the economy is more elastic and responsive than it is given credit for. If the government sets the most appropriate targets stemming from an environmental impact perspective, investment and innovation will follow.

Nicolas Olivares

Dear Politicians,

Nature is ahead of our plans for the management of climate change. The experts in the field have been reading the 'signs' and trying to alert the politicians and the public.

We need our politicians to whom we have entrusted the well-being of our people and country to pay attention to their findings. The situation calls for a united front and not divisive debate. Trusting you to honour your position as our elected leaders.

Lynette M pearce

I am writing to express my dismay at the inclusion in recent climate policy of a 'floor' beyond which emissions cannot fall. It is simply laughable that a government claiming to be taking action on climate change could include such a clause.

The emissions reduction targets are already inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change - especially given recent scientific findings showing that the rate of climate change is higher than previously believed - and the imposition of a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall means that Australians are powerless to help emissions decrease any further.

It sends an extremely discouraging message to the Australian people about their ability to make a difference - ie, that any reductions they might make will only serve to allow someone else to pollute more.

Please, please strengthen the emissions targets, stop over compensating polluters and start seriously supporting renewable energy enterprises - for all our sakes.

Sincerely,
Jess Halstead-Smith (B.Sc., M.Env.)

The good intentions of members of this Government who really believed that they would take strong action to address climate change have been hijacked by big business. Business interests are at odds with dealing with climate change because they are only interested in making money. Governments are only interested in getting re-elected and are not prepared to take on big business. hence, as I see it, climate chage will not be addressed in this country with this weak government. How disappointing!! Surely there are still some members with principles: Greg Combet? Peter Garrett? Maxine? if necessary, get rid of Rudd!!!

regards,
patricia Morton

I think it is vital that Australia leads the world in reducing carbon emissions. We should be setting targets of reducing greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels.

Industry has to bite the bullet and reduce their emissions significantly and we must refocus our attention on renewable energy sources.

Susan Stewart

Our government should be acting responsibly on behalf of our children and our grandchildren.

The government MUST take an pro-active and firm stance by setting high targets for reduction of greenhouse gases.

In doing so the Australian government will show business and commerce that when they seek alternatives the government will support them in every way possible to avoid depleting natural resources as well as preventing air and environmental pollution.

It's not just up to individuals and communities - most gas pollution comes from big business. The government has a responsibility to create incentives and priority awards for all Australian industry, commerce and trade that develop new products or incorporates strategies for assisting the government and global community in reducing greenhouse gases.

DONT ASK developing nations to match our commitment before committing Australia - An altruistic society/government would find it morally unjust to expect them to be asked to compromise an improvement in their living standards simply because we want to maintain our unrealistic levels of affluence.

The members of government all know about the uneconomic growth that has caused poverty, homelessness, deforestation and pollution - how about taking a socially mature stand on this matter immediately by committing our nation to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions 50% by 2020.

Jose Nemorin

Plympton Park

It may already be too late to significantly slow or minimise the early stage - severe degradation of our shared environment as a steady stream of scientific findings show the climate change is "BITING US ALL" more severely and more quickly than predicted.

However, we have to try and turn around this Titanic (carbon besotted civilisation) sooner rather than later and our polluter friendly 5-15% targets are too weak and actually provide a free ride to the big polluters to continue on polluting in this country and to use the money gained to "MOVE THEIR INDUSTRIES TO LOW POLLUTING COUNTRIES AND REGIONS" elsewhere in the world - to strategically set themselves up for when the world's targets actually get tougher.

One of the big issues MISSED by our spineless politicians is that IF Australia gets on the leading edge of greenhouse gas reduction - we will be one of the countries able to capitalise on the INEVITABLE future green world economy. The future is NOT in coal, petroleum, big polluting industry and big energy cities

Regards
Ian Hampton

Dear Mr Rudd,

Good Lord! Did you think we wouldn't be watching once you were elected. I helped to vote you in under the impression that you and your government would deliver real change to our ongoing impact to climate change. Now it seems you've forgot the platform on which you were elected.

5-15% reductions to carbon emissions just won't cut it. Did you see what's happening to the Wilson Ice Shelf in Antarctica this week? It's falling off! Our ultimate goal should be carbon neutrality as quickly as possible, not as little as a 5% reduction.

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.

I am urging you to "please reconsider".

Luke Gerner.

I am the grandmother to 13 beautiful young Australians. I look at the latest reports on the melting ice caps and fear for my grandchildren's future. Australians believed when the Rudd government was elected that this would make a huge difference to our standing in the world as leaders on climate change. I am doing everything I can within my means as a pensioner to reduce carbon pollution and I am extremely disappointed to find that the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme actually allows heavy polluting industry to continue polluting. Please, please set a stronger target so that we can become the leaders in climate change action that we were led to believe we would be.

Loretta Dun n

I urge the government to take more action in addressing global warming. Australia is an extremely fragile ecosystem, more so than any other first world country, and we stand to lose enormously if we choose to embrace badly designed and half-hearted measures to tackle climate change. Already, we are in the midst of experiencing record high temperatures, droughts and floods. I should imagine that the cost of these climatic extremes are already costing the taxpayers of Australia more than measures to prevent such occurrences. The government's proposed target reduction of 5-15 percent is pathetically inadequate and greatly distresses me. I implore the government to implement a 50 percent reduction in emissions on 1990 levels by 2020 and to revise the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme so that there is room to reduce emissions further and that high polluters are not compensated.

Let Australia leaders show courage and make the hard decisions for the greater good.

Sincerely
Amanda Hooper-Duffy

Dear Sir

There is no doubt that the 5-15% TARGET is not even trying to reduce greenhouse pollution. There are so many small things that should be in action now which could count for 5% minimum reduction - widespread solar and all the other clean energy solutions.

It appears that big business is holding the Government round the neck as usual.

However you look at it, coal production will decrease whether you like it or not - it is becoming obvious to all countries that we cannot afford to keep polluting the planet. So start getting rid of it now, not increasing production as the NSW Government is doing.

It is a disgrace.

Sue Patchett

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I am extremely disappointed with the targets set by the government in regard to climate change. Australia is being affected as I write this, by climate change. We are one of the most vulnerable countries on the planet because of our naturally unforgiving climate.

A target of 5% is a pittance compared to what is required. I was hoping after the years of Howards climate change denials Australia would finally be in a leadership position on this issue, but I have been let down.

I understand that conserving jobs is important, but economies are not independent of the environment. The use of coal has reached its natural end. It is not fair to place the lives of millions at risk for the sake of a few thousand jobs. Occupations naturally fade away. There are very few blacksmiths or wagon wheel makers around anymore. That is because these jobs have become obsolete.

I hope you take the advice of scientists around the world and act on this issue appropriately. Give incentive to renewable energy investors and put large polluters on notice.

We only get one planet, jobs come and go.

Nathaniel Howard

Dear Friends,

I trust I am joining my voice with thousands of other Australians to express my disgust at the governments in-operation or disinterest or inactivity towards the seriousness of our planet regarding Climate Change.

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

I want to be a part of sharing the responsibility and await any move in a positive direction; so that we can and will all play our part. But the government needs to take the lead in this very urgent turn-around.

Sincerely yours,

Keith Birks

Dear Penny Wong,

We have all our electricity coming from our own solar panels now.

Please make sure that the targets take account of individual people's efforts and do not allow the coal-fired power stations to make no changes. Also, using overseas forest conservation as a method of emission reduction also avoids the problem of cleaning up our own mess, as you know well.

I admire very much the way you handle the whingers who think only of their own interest and I know what a huge problem you are pushing up a very steep hill, but please know that most of the community is very worried and is pushing with you.

Best wishes for you hard battle ahead,

Regards,

Trish Wilkinson

PS I went to see my MHR, Annette Ellis, in December, so I have made an effort to understand and be active on the issue.

(1) ~ The problem with WATER & the ENVIRONMENT?

SHORTAGE OF WATER? ~ WE HAVE PLENTY BEING WASTED!

"WE URGENTLY NEED ANOTHER DAM OR TWO IN THE EASTERN STATES!"

The rivers in Eastern States are so very low now the worst they have ever been! A lot of Farmers are thinking of quitting! This water problem is going to get worse!

"Every year it Floods in this particular Area of Southern Queensland & also in Northern N.S.W."

In Victoria they have been on Restrictions for years! Think of the expense & upheaval of what all this costs every Year in damages from Flooding when this "Particular Area" is the obvious place to build a Dam.

It is not only the cost to Humans but to the Flora & Fauna as well.

What does it Cost to recycle sewerage & waste water for human consumption that a lot of people are reluctant to use?

This is why more Dams are needed.

Why haven't we got the " VISION" to do something about all this wastage of water??? It's so blatantly obvious! The population hugs the Coastlines when all this water could be used to irrigate much further inland and open up more farmland.

In the Future the World will need a larger food chain which we could supply.

S.C.Millward

(2) GREENHOUSE GASSES! ~ Blame the USA who have so many cars on their roads & won't fall in with the Requests of other Nations.

Blame "Australia" our lack of FORESIGHT & Accepting what the Yanks are doing to the environment & think this country should follow suit & not upset any of the Large Companies here in Australia.

These BIG COMPANIES with all the profits they have made over the years should now be made to solve & pay for the problem they have caused &

All their decisions made known in Parliament!

This should not be paid for by the TAXPAYER.

You could also blame Advertising, Computers & Newspapers they just waste paper which floods in excess into every letterbox in the Country.

Something needs to be done about what these greedy people are doing to our PLANET & TREES.

Most Rubbish Mail is thrown into the bin without even having been read!

Newspapers are so full up with advertising that most people just want the small T.V. Booklet inside.

This should be sold separately as the public is "compelled" to buy the whole Newspaper which is either left behind at the Newsagents or tossed into the bin afterwards.

I don't know where we are going but eventually, if something isn't done about it ~ the TREES will all be gone and they are the LUNGS which help to clean up some of the Pollution.

The only resource in Indonesia are Trees & look at the smoke haze from all the burning & only a minority are profiting from raping their country.

Why do we need to import their wood to build our houses?

They should be considering growing other things to export.

Look at what is happening to the Amazon vast forests which were a wilderness have gone!

A big wakeup call! ~ Parliament & Companies could save \$\$\$ if they made use of the backs of computer paper to write on for use in some Departments / Accounts or write Telephone messages on etc.

It's all just WASTED & chucked in the bin for recycling ? or burnt perhaps!

During the Second World War ~ My mother wrote on the backs of JAM tin labels for shopping lists etc & we all know we had to use Newspaper cut up for Toilet Paper.

We could learn a lot from China who are so resourceful ~ who are now using the Electric Car on their roads to stop pollution.

The greed for OIL this Easter the price for Petrol has increased again it's so predictable just before a Holiday.

The younger generation in this World have been so indulged & need to learn to Economize more & not be so wasteful.

This is just a small way to help the Environment & the Economy, but it has to start in our workplaces & with Big Businesses to discuss the Problem.

But let it not be ~ " ALL TALK & NO DO! "

S.C Millward

1. The 5-15% target is too low according to IPCC who recommended a target between 25 to 40 % and now experts are saying that that is too low a target.
 - 2 There must be an emissions cap apart from moral reasons this would disadvantage us in the long run, as other nations forge ahead with renewable energy and alternative industry, prompted by strict emissions reduction requirements. The wealthy industries that have profited from pollution must be made, like everyone else, to pay their way in a carbon constrained world.
 3. The number of free units to be issued to EITEs must be capped.
 4. Assistance to coal-fired generators should be contingent on a phase-out plan.
 5. Reforestation projects under the CPRS do not exclude logging and can be "offsets" for industrial emissions.
 6. There are no third party rights
- Third party prosecutions have made a significant contribution to environmental and social law in Australia, and given the immense importance of this Bill for the future of Australian society, it is vital that third party rights be established under any CPRS Act.

Marguerite Marshall

9/4/09

The climate is changing very rapidly already. We need to reduce carbon emissions much, much faster. The reason for climate change is because humans are taking from the earth at a faster rate than it can replenish itself.

There are far too many humans on earth. Population is nearly 7 billion, when we should probably only have half a billion. The Australian Gvt. has not helped matters by encouraging people to have more and more children.

As one academic has said : If we do not reduce our population humanely, nature will do it for us brutally.

As we cannot just bump off over 6 billion people, then population growth will have to go into negative growth, and people will have to curtail their disgraceful overuse of the planet.

P.Audrey Robb, Maryborough, Qld. 45650

I wish to protest at the inadequacy of the government's proposed 5% to 15% reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 compared with year 2000 levels. Scientific advice assures us that these reductions will not be enough to prevent catastrophic climate change. The carbon pollution reduction scheme must be strong enough to give people the incentive to change consumption patterns to lower emissions. This can be done at relatively low cost as many of the adjustments simply involve an initial additional investment to achieve savings in energy costs, such as with long life light globes or home insulation. The minimum reduction should be 25%.

Also, emissions savings from voluntary schemes such as Green Power must be additional to the emissions savings from the carbon pollution reduction scheme, as otherwise these voluntary schemes will be abruptly terminated and there will be an immediate increase in emissions.

Yours faithfully,

Ross Mewton, 69 Hastings Parade Bondi NSW 2026

The Government's proposed target of reducing carbon emissions is far from adequate considering the rapid climate change already upon us. We need a more committed carbon reduction target of at least 50% by 2020.

I am also concerned that the the Government proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is an inadequate solution to reducing carbon emissions.

I would like to call on the Government to have direct investment in renewable energy to achieve 80-100% clean energy production by 2020. To have a moratorium on coal powered electricity with fair and just transition plans to green jobs for the affected workers and communities. And for the Australian Government to adopt a strong international position at the United Nations Climate Change Conference of Parties at Copenhagen in December this year.

Yours sincerely,
Kyllien Hitchman

To whomever this may concern,

Climate change is a major problem facing the people of the world. It is people that will be effected by climate change. Australians will be effected by climate change but most notably it will be the world's most vulnerable and poorest people that will suffer dreadfully from the effects of climate change.

As one of the world leaders and one of the richest nations on Earth, Australia and the Australian Governemnt does not only have a responsibilty to its own people (which it obviously cares little about with its weak carbon emission targets) but it has a responsibilty as a global power to other people in other countries that will be effected by Australia's weak climate change policy.

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

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

Please, please, please do not take what you are doing lightly, do not put reforms to this scheme in the too hard basket and do not let private interests of rich companies come before the public good and public interest.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Sheridan young

A concerned global citizen that has faith her government will do more to reduce their contribution to climate change.

Dear Senate,

The proposed targets of 5-15% is simply not enough. When considering the scientific literature and IPCC reports, what difference will 5% or even 15% have on the global impacts of climate change? This minimal reduction in GHG emissions is not going to make the significant change that is required to reduce the devastating consequences of climate change. These include increased health issues in developing countries, increased biodiversity and ecosystem loss and the long term ongoing economic costs which will occur unless tough restrictions are implemented NOW.

A reduction of GHG emissions by 50% before 2020 is a better target to aim for in order to produce significant results.

This target demonstrates the Australia Government's inability and unwillingness to step forward as an international leader, which may compromise agreements in Copenhagen in December this year.

The CPRS is poorly designed because it encourages big polluters, while squandering the efforts made by communities and small scale businesses. This so called 'solution' will not be effective at reducing GHG emissions in a fair manner.

It is not sensible, beneficial or cost effective to implement a target that is not scientifically based or supported.

Yes, higher targets will require greater economic investment, but the money spent now to mitigate the threat will prevent the future long term costs as a result of unabated climate change.

Please take notice of the public submissions made by the community.

Thank you,
Jessica Walsh

I am very concerned that the governments proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will have very little effect in combating climate change. The target of 5 -15% is not adequate to avoid climate change. Already Climate scientist are telling us that warming is occurring at a faster rate than was predicted. We need to do more sooner, not less later.

I am very concerned that very heavy carbon polluters are being overcompensated and so have little incentive to develop more efficient technologies.

I am absolutely distressed that all the actions I have taken to reduce my carbon footprint will not reduce Australia's overall greenhouse emissions as the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme imposes a floor below which emissions cannot fall. All my hard won pushbike rides and electricity saving measures will only allow big polluters to use more.

On an international level, we also need to be seen to be doing our fair share to reduce carbon pollution by setting a stronger target.

It seems to me that the Labour Party has bowed down to big business in this matter and dropped their election promises to the people.

In your consideration of the review of the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, I urge you to make changes to rectify these important weaknesses in the scheme.

Yours sincerely

Margaret Nouwens

As a voting adult Australian citizen I urge the Rudd government to be brave and face the very real problem of climate change head on. I realise it is a sometimes difficult situation to please everyone, especially large investors but we have run out of time. For the sake of the future of our country, not to mention the world, I implore you represent the people that voted you into government and tackle seriously, with a SERIOUS target. There is no more time for compensating industry - act now, make australia proud, we had enough environmental shame during the last government.

Yours extremely sincerely, Kiri Smart

hi to whom it may concern, it concerns me a little that it appears you are caving in to the big polluters and letting them off the hook. either you act to make a difference or you dont act at all and if that is the case stand aside and let someone who isnt afraid to face the big polluters down stand in your place. I mean come on what have you got to lose that you wont lose anyway, cheers richard lane, merino, vic
From: michele.schlosser@gmail.com

I was devastated when the government announced the ridiculous 5% carbon reduction target! Instead we need to be aiming for 50% reduction by 2020.

One of the ice shelves in Antarctica has split, the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt entirely within 5 years and the soaring temperatures in S.A. and Victoria this summer are all terrifying portents of our future world.

We actually need to stop pretending that there is such a thing as 'clean coal' and stop exporting this pollutant to other countries. Jobs and retraining should be found in the Green Economy which we should be building now.

The Government's CPRS will over-compensate polluters because it imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall. Industry has the green light to take up any slack in emissions brought about by the rest of the community. That is outrageous!

This is too important to neglect!

Michele Schlosser

Dear Senate Select Inquiry,

I am concerned that the proposed target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is insufficient to avoid dangerous climate change and does not do enough to encourage businesses to make use of renewable energy or to develop products and industries that capitalise on the expanding market for renewable energies.

I want more than is proposed. A 50% reduction by 2020 would provide much greater certainty.

I am concerned about the current design of the scheme, and would like polluters to be more responsible for their waste. Yes, I am prepared to pay more for carbon-intensive products.

thanks,

Andrew Redmond

I am concerned about the Australian Government's response to climate change. I do not believe the climate change policy will adequately address the issues of climate change.

According to leading world scientists climate change is accelerating and the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to be completely melted within five years.

I am also concerned about the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) with the Rudd Government is proposing. Serious concerns have been raised about this scheme and its ability to compensate major polluters at the expense of the environment and the community.

I welcome the decision by the Greens, Opposition and the Independents to hold an enquiry into the Government's climate change policies.

Your sincerely

Lynne McLachlan

I am against any industry getting free permits to pollute. It gives them no incentive to increase efficiency.

I would like to see all industries buying permits to cover a minimum of 5% of their pollution.

I buy 100% Green Power. I would like my contribution recognised in the total cap. I don't want my savings given away to a polluter.

I want to see a higher emissions reduction target.

I want stimulus packages aimed at renewable energy and energy efficiency. Solar hot water and PV cells can be installed on every government building - even Parliament House. Insulation can be installed in all public housing.

Thanks,

Robert Domone

To The Greens, Opposition and Independents

Just this week a huge amount of the Antarctic shelf is poised to drop into the ocean. The mid north coast has just had it third 1:100 year storm event in the past 12 months. (clearly a true 1:100 year event is much more severe than it was just 10 or 20 years ago!)

The problem is here and now!

We need to make drastic adjustments in emissions right now, or humanity has no future. Don't worry about the loss of jobs in the short term. If there is no one here jobs will not be an issue.

This is urgent.

Please act on behalf of the countless generations yet to be born!

Declan Tierney

Australia should be leading the world on reducing carbon pollution, not dragging its feet.

Each week it seems that we hear bad news on how changes are happening more quickly than predicted - the breakage of the ice bridge attaching part of the Wilkins ice shelf to the Antarctic Peninsula is the latest example.

This underlines how urgent it is to act quickly and decisively.

Remember that the economy totally depends on the environment.

Lynda Prior

Please priorities the welfare of the climate/planet and not the economy.

Steve Adams

I am left completely disgusted, dumbfounded and outraged by the Rudd Government's climate change policy.

At a time when scientific findings become more and more alarming every day - I cannot believe the disconnect between Australian politicians (who seem to listen exclusively to lobbyists working in polluting industries) and the community (whose fears are growing alongside the increasingly apocalyptic scientific evidence of observed climatic changes and predictions).

There are many parts of the CPRS requiring drastic changes:

- the targets are insulting and pathetic
- the fact that there is unlimited purchasing of overseas carbon credits makes even those pathetic targets irrelevant
- the policy is massive confirmation of the excessive power of the fossil fuel lobby in this country - a national disgrace. They have gotten more than they could have hoped for out of the scheme and are still complaining
- perhaps the part of the CPRS that most upsets me is that it makes my work and the work of many others in the community to reduce our own emissions and do 'our bit' as the Government so often urges us to do, completely pointless.

Instead of this hugely flawed we need a swift and equitable transformation to a society powered by 100% renewable energy. Where is the leadership?

Kind Regards,

T.E.

It must be abundantly clear to all by now, even the fossil fuel industry, that much stronger action is needed to reduce CO2 emissions, and by a much bigger extent than the Commonwealth government plans.

I am active in Brolga conservation in South-West Victoria. Climate change has already set brolgas here up for extinction as breeding success is currently almost nil and is well below replacement level. WHY? The swamps they used to breed in are dry. The Brolga population is ageing; individuals are passing breeding age, then they will die off.

There is no Victorian recovery program for Brolgas. If a program is ever begun it will incur huge costs with little result as seen with the 25 year Eastern barred bandicoot recovery program.

Now is the time to put the climate change effort onto a war footing. Borrowing to fund it is more important than borrowing to stimulate the economy. There will be no economy in a ruined environment.

Gavin E Cerini

Kevin

1 A 5-15% greenhouse emission target - you've got to be kidding! 50% by 2020 based on 1990 levels would be more like it - PLEASE, get serious! That's why we elected YOU.

2. We need a well-designed scheme, not a token effort like the CPRS. We're counting on YOU for that.

3. What's the use of individuals like me making drastic changes in our own home when industry and government is basically laughing at us and not supporting or encouraging our efforts?

Kevin, your climate policy is seriously flawed and wildly inadequate. Get real and make climate policy your priority - that's what you promised us before you were elected - so please, JUST DO IT! You and we will be glad you did.

Thanks.

Val Anderson

Urgent that Australia set much stronger targets to deal with the dangers of global warming, and that local initiatives on renewable energy are given strong encouragement.

Chris Watson

Hi to the government. As a Certified Environmental Practitioner (76), and a facilities manager for sustainability I urge you to take the lead in the global movement for climate change response. Raise the target to true sustainability levels more like 50% reductions by 2020. Any less is just playing politics.

Dr Su Wild-River

The proposed 5-15% target is totally inadequate to slow the dangerous levels of climate change already being detected.

The impending collapse of the huge Antarctic ice shelf is evidence of this.

Australia's weak target must be improved before the UN Conference in Copenhagen.

The proposed carbon Pollution reduction Scheme is badly designed . It over-compensates polluters.

Setting a strong target with a well designed scheme will ensure Australia plays its part in the world effort.

We need to be focusing on growth industries in renewable energy.

We need to be real about our actions. not allow industry to increase their emissions under the proposed CPRS cap.

Myree Harris

Senators

When I was growing up I well recall the nuclear crisis clock which has now thankfully been put into storage for now.

Its successor is far more formidable - the climate change crisis clock.

I read just this week of yet more evidence of even worse than predicted climate change from data in the Arctic revealing changes already underway that threaten tipping a positive feedback loop of destruction.

Senators, the Climate Clock is NOW (not next year, NOT next decade) less than 1 minute to devastation.

It is for my children and grandchildren to bear the consequences - lightweight political compromise decisions in the House and Senate to date are token only.

If you fail to heed the increasing volume of solid data and make real commitments NOW you and your descendants will bear the failure to do so for generations to come.

Don't let the Climate Change Clock strike midnight - ACT NOW to make real commitments!

-Greg Wallace

EVERYTHING I READ confirms that 5% GUARANTEES a 2degree climb. It would be irresponsible, criminal, to weaken resolve at that non-effective level.

No. Bullets are for biting. Politicians jobs are insignificant and must not stand in the way of efforts to save the planet.

Stop this cowardly approach. Better to go down fighting the good fight than by knuckling under to populist pushes!

PETER CLANCY

As the world's greatest per capita polluters I want Australia to show the lead and target reductions that are at least 25% greater than the OECD average.

Please ensure that we do take substantial action and not the pussy footing around being suggested by the Governments White Paper.

Roger Byrne

Australia need to take a lead and demonstrate its committment to reducing carbon emissions through significant reduction targets.

I want to add my voice to the growing number of Australians who believe significantly more action is needed by the government to achive lower carbon emissions.

Peter Abbott

Even if it is unpopular to the big end of town, let's have a government which is not managed by business but wants to give some sort of decent world to the following generations.

Now is the time to fund new sustainable industries rather than the ones and their management which have got us into this mess.

Michael D. Breen

Dear Sir/Madam,

I really urge the Australian government to be very honest and courageouse with the Australian people on climate change.

I urge you to set targets of AT LEAST 50% reductions on Australia's Greenhouse Pollution by 2020.

I also urge you to ensure that a sum-zero game is not set up where if household reduce their carbon output that this lets big industry polute more. Everyone must do their part.

And yes, I realise this MAY mean a reduction in the standard of living of Australians. This is the price we need to pay to ensure the survival of the planet.

It's a shame that you are spending \$40 billion on a new communications network (which is a nice to have but our survival as a species doesn't depend on it) instead of investing the same amount of money on our survival. I imagine that kind of investment would build a lot of renewable energy!!??

Regards

Michael Wood

Dear Sir/Madam,

There were many major issues during the election campaign. And one of these most crucial to us all is about the environment.

Due to current GFC, the environment seems to have taken a back seat.

In 3-5 years, we will be on the road to recovery from a GDP perspective, this is inevitable. But then we will wonder, about what actions we should have taken about the environment.

Secondly, from a commercial perspective, there is a lot of advantage, being one of the first movers into green technology, and allowing our businesses to compete.

From garbage recycling to corporate environment responsibility, we appear to be behind that of the Europe and Canada.

I envisioned Australia setting the pace, apparently I was dreaming.

Your sincerely,

Bob Ratnarajah

Australia must lead rather than follow when it comes to taking strong and speedy action in response to climate change. We are major polluters on a per capita basis compared with most of the world. We are an affluent nation, and the modest cost of acting now can be afforded and will save far greater monetary and non-monetary costs now. We also export large amounts of coal, a major source of pollution.

For all these reasons Australia must set stronger targets than those proposed to date by the government. We must also work to reduce our own burning of coal as quickly as possible.

Thank you

Dr Robert Gill

In order for Australia and the world to survive the impending threats of Climate change there needs to be a display of strong leadership from governments and world leaders. This is clearly not on display in Australia where a tokenistic 'emissions trading scheme' is being implemented. Australia needs to aim for at least 50% less greenhouse gas pollution by 2020 (based on 1990 levels). Even physical evidence doesn't seem to be doing the trick, The Arctic and the Antarctic are literally and visibly melting at alarming rates, at rates faster even 'dooms day' scientists predicted. If the current 'emissions trading scheme' prevails, Australia will indeed be the laughing stock in Copenhagen in December.

Despite Kevin Rudd and his government claiming Economic Rationalism does not work, it is still favouring a market (chaos) driven carbon 'trading' scheme. What the government needs to realise is that delaying the apparent inevitable is only going to mean that our economy will in fact be in huge trouble when the effects of climate change become worse.

Australia needs to grow up and take some responsibility.

Lachlan Slade

As a young Australian I'd never been very engaged in politics. That was until the last election when the Rudd government promised some real change in policy areas that resonated with me. There was some great progress made early on which had me hopeful, with the signing of Kyoto and the Apology to Indigenous Australians. But over the last year - culminating in the plans for the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme - I have slowly become disillusioned by the government's decisions.

I am a firm believer in the power of individuals to create change, so you can imagine my shock on reading through GetUp! and the Australia Institute that according to the CPRS draft legislation my personal efforts will amount to nothing. I had been developing plans to lead an energy efficiency program and a switch to renewable energy within my block of units in Northcote, Victoria. My plans are now on hold, as currently these actions will only make it cheaper for other polluters to continue there ways.

I am at a loss at how the proposed system could suggest that physical and behavioural changes be less effective than purchasing and not using carbon credits? How absurd is it that the most effective way for me to reduce Australia's emissions beyond the abysmal target of 5% is to buy a piece of paper and tear it up? Not to mention that personal efforts are further muddled by the phantom credits introduced under the new solar rebate scheme. And then to make matters worse \$4 billion dollars collected from the scheme is to be handed back to the heaviest polluters instead of invested in technologies and industries to help secure Australia's future.

But more alarming is the urgency of the problem. We must ready to look the rest of the world in the eye when we go to Copenhagen in December and say that Australia, one of the highest emitters of greenhouse gas per capita, is serious about joining the international community in addressing the most issue pressing issue of our time

I applaud the funding of the Energy Innovation Fund and Australian Solar Institute, these will be incredibly powerful tools in growing research and development within Australia. However, I'm alarmed at the current lack of government incentives for investors in solar energy to establish commercial and large scale operations. I am about to commence a masters course in sustainable energy this year, with the hope of working in the solar energy sector within the next two years. I can only hope that conditions have improved by the time I graduate or I will be forced to take my skills overseas.

Regards,

Michael Ferguson

If everybody else knows that now is the time for strong action in regards to climate change, why is the government falling behind?

Now is the time for action, not later, there is enough evidence to prove we have to act now.

Please stand up and do something for our country, and our planet, and the future of our planet.

Susan Hoerlein

Australia has an opportunity to set a good example rather than a bad example to the world.

Our policies should require more from ourselves than we ask of other nations.

Protect our future.

Dan Vantari

Very few will deny this great turning point of history, and many Australians are not only willing to make much needed changes to their lifestyles, but expect strong leadership in the area of the environment.

The Labor Federal Government climate policy does not do enough to protect our country for the citizens of today, and for future generations.

It appears that the government would prefer to reward industry, for the work that individuals and families of this country would do in order to sustain a future for this nation.

It is ridiculous in the face of todays human impacted physical climate to not set higher emission reduction targets, when it is obvious the community and the economy are READY for change.
POSITIVE CHANGE.

AIM FOR THE STARS AND LAND ON THE ROOF RATHER THAN AIM FOR THE ROOF AND LAND IN THE MUD

Regards

Rachel Heatno

All of us can make a difference, yes, even the little people! But, we can't do it without solid leadership that is willing to step up and away from rhetoric and literally take action!

If we continue to take half measures in policy making and ignore the persistent warning signs, the scientific research and data provided, it will be at our peril for not future generations but NOW, this generation. Next generation will be buggered!

For God's sake - yes, this is not just a political issue but a social and moral issue, stop the rot and get on with it! Take a stand and make the tough decisions that must be made. We don't have time for policy that is driven by making voters happy.

There is so much that needs to be done that past governments have refused to acknowledge. You have been given the mandate by the people - use it, the people voted for it! Remember?!

Michelle Hall

I am writing to express my concern about the governments low targets for reducing greenhouse gas pollution. Climate change is here now and happening much more quickly than was previously thought. People are starting to do more - in their own homes and businesses, but the government needs to lead the way and show that they are serious about Climate Change. Setting a target of 50% would go a long way to help slow the irreversible changes that are happening to our planet. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, currently proposed by the Government over compensates polluters at the expense of the community and only gives businesses the idea that this climate change thing is all talk and that they don't have to do any more than what is asked of them.

I work in the field of food and nutrition and it is very scary to think about what will happen to our food supply given worsening droughts, floods, fires, heatwaves etc. We will not be able to rely on imports to make up for Australian food supply issues. Chronic diseases that are already at ridiculous rates in our community will only continue to get worse. I could go on and on but i really just wanted to put forward my dissatisfaction with the Governments low targets on emissions. Please stand up and take the lead for the good of our planet and the health of future generations.

Regards

Jenny Trezise, APD, AN

Attn The Hon Kevin Rudd

Generally speaking I think you are an excellent prime minister. However I am disappointed about the low greenhouse gas reductions target. Climate Change is serious, serious, serious. Please reconsider your position and commit to reducing pollution to 50% of 1990 levels. I am very happy to accept a change in living standards in order to preserve life on this planet.

Kind Regards

Andrew

We are the generation that has to act. Twenty years ago we could say that we didn't know, ten years ago we weren't sure, today we know that we are responsible for the state of our planet. 5% reduction in carbon emissions is not enough - the science shows us. Every day there is breaking science that shows Global Climate Change has been underestimated, then the underestimation has been underestimated! Once the feedback mechanism turns there is no going back, it will be too late. Australia must act now. Follow the USA's lead, set a realistic target that can set us and the developing world up for a sustainable future. We have to take coal out of the equation, our future will be renewable and there is no reason why Australia can't lead the way. Get Real, set a honest target that we can all live with!

Sonya Stallbaum

In my view, action on climate change rates as an essential priority for the Australian government. While many are concerned about the global financial crisis and growing unemployment, the stark fact is that the environment demands our immediate attention. So much damage has already been sustained that further delay will translate into greater loss of life for human beings and further irretrievable damage to the planet.

I urge the government to adopt true leadership and to put climate action as a higher priority. Specifically, this requires a substantial increase on the 5-15% target for reduction of greenhouse gas pollution and an emission policy that genuinely supports renewable energy rather than propping up and encouraging the old industries that have contributed to the problem.

Yours sincerely

Pamela Hewitt

I would like to see much stricter targets set by the government - a fifty percent (50%) reduction in 1990 levels by the year 2020.

This would encourage a strong response, as the targeted 5% level minimum will be too easy to excuse as insignificant and therefore lead to no change in the nation's activities.

Indeed, a weak 5% level will be seen by other countries as being weak and insignificant and not set the lead that I would like to see set by the Australian Government.

At least a 50% target will cause real behaviour change and set the example that I believe is necessary to encourage change by other countries as well.

My own family have reduced our environmental footprint by more than 5% already by installing solar water heating, low energy fluorescent lighting and other energy conservation efforts. We want to see the government set new targets beyond this, not to include what we have already done.

As I write this, the news is that a seventh great ice sheet on the Antarctic continent is in the process of breaking up - the last disappeared in a matter of weeks, despite geological evidence of their existence for more than 10,000 years. This is widely acknowledged to be due to thinning of the ice sheet from below by water warmed by the rise in global temperatures.

We may not be able to change this immediately, but a strong 50% target will send a clear signal that we mean to be effective in our response.

Please set a strong target so that my children and their children's children will have a better environment and higher quality of life to look forward to.

Austin G. Milton, BSc (Hons), Dip Comp Sci.

For the attention of the Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy:

I want to lend my voice to the thousands of others around Australia calling out for greater efforts in tackling Climate Change.

The Governments 5-15% target is no where near acceptable and limits Australia's potential to be a world leader in climate action discussions and negotiations. I implore the members of the Senate inquiry and the Federal Government to act with courage, foresight and moral/environmental conviction to increase this target to a 50% reduction by 2020.

Desperate times call for desperate measures, and these are certainly desperate times.

Climate change is occurring far more quickly than previously thought which means the time to act is NOW!

As a careful and thoughtful citizen I abhor the CPRS proposed by the government and particularly it's emphasis on penalizing me and compensating the major Polluters.

Finally, in the current economic climate there might be a hesitancy to adopt stricter measures, for fear of political backlash. Let me urge all in a position of influence to consider the global ramifications of the looming environmental collapse and challenge them to set the course of the future in the right direction. We might be ready to fix the economy to ensure our consumptive lifestyles, but are we ready to act with the same decisiveness toward the environment. Surely, a more well rounded attack on environmental degradation will result in better economic solutions, that are sustainable and future looking.

Thank you for your time.

Yours Expectantly,

Tim Burns

The Government's weak 5% greenhouse reduction target is unacceptable. It is TOO LOW to be meaningful in avoiding climate change.

It will lock Australia out of international negotiations - we will just look weak and irrelevant. We will not set an example to other States. Australia's weak stance will undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change.

We need to raise the target to address the deep carbon cuts we need to avoid dangerous climate change.

L. B. Cairnes

David tomlinson

Climate change is coming at us like a sunami. Urgent action is needed. The Government's five per cent target by 2020 is woefully inadequate and betrays future generations of Australians.

All the Australians I have spoken to are prepared for sacrifices to achieve a much lower level of emissions. We know it will cost us more but we also know the alternative is environmental disaster.

What will happen to Australia if climate change brings drought and famine to large parts of the world? We might survive if everyone stays put - but they will not. Billions of refugees could be on the move in the next couple of decades.

It is your responsibility to make sure we take action now.

Change the targets and change the CPRS scheme.

Bring the Australian people with you. Provide us with real incentives for solar power (gross feed in tariffs) , for cleaner cars by changing tax rules that make polluting cars subsidise eco-friendly cars.

We want to do our bit but we feel emasculated by a limp wristed approach from the Federal Government and a lack of incentives.

Why should I sacrifice if it makes zero difference to Australia's emissions?

We know that disaster will strike if we do nothing.

But are we smart enough?

Are we smarter than the other extinct species which either outgrew their environment or failed to adapt?

Please take real action.

With climate change happening much faster than even the most pessimistic scientists have predicted, we need an urgent and powerful response from the Australian Government to lead the world in the essential change. I can't believe we are still planning to reward polluters for continuing to pollute. The Carbon Emission Scheme as proposed is a joke and seriously flawed in its basic premise that bows to the pressure of the most powerful polluters and does little to really address the problem.

Let's get serious before it is even more too late than it already is

Rod Anderson!

Carbon credits are not the answer to environmental pollution. They appear to be a political device to avoid imposing unpopular regulations on powerful sections of the electorate.

If we care about our grandchildren and their grandchildren, then we must put all our efforts into developing environmentally friendly energy production. NOW.

Roger McCracken

As a citizen of Australia, I cannot afford to stand by and watch without protesting the weak targets.

We are custodians of this planet not owners, and if we don't act with strong targets of 50% reduction by 2020 there will be great danger for future generations.

Please listen before we lose Summer polar sea ice completely!

Pamela Adams

TO: The Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Change Policy

In order that future generations are able to live on Planet Earth it is critical that we act now so that the planet remains habitable for humans and other animals.

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 to stop woodchipping, reduce our population, reduce pollution from cars and ENCOURAGE RENEWABLE ENERGY.

Thank you

Susan Coleman

I am really disappointed with the response of the Australian Government to the reduction of carbon emissions.

5% is not acceptable.

Why can we not use the current economic climate to facilitate a change from carbon polluting technology/systems to "cleaner and greener" manufacturing practices. Let's "stimulate" new industries as we spend our way out of the current economic crisis.

Ron Miller

Please consider making a target higher than the proposed 5-15% reduction by 2020. All the evidence points out that it needs to be 50% to really make a difference.

The need is urgent with new scientific findings indicating that the climate is changing much more quickly than was expected.

I am doing my bit at home as much as I am able but that will not make much difference, it is action at government level that will really count.

Dr Dawn Smith

I am bewildered.

All of this debate about climate change and our future ultimately seems misguided. That is the only conclusion that I can come to when I consider the pathetic emission targets, the badly designed CPRS and the disregard for the latest scientific findings.

We need to build on our innovative renewable energy growth industry, we need to find a system that doesn't ultimately benefit the big polluters and discourage everyday folk and small business.

People are willing to change their everyday lives. Big business needs to understand this and act accordingly, not continue on as always. It's an enormous shift but absolutely crucial.

This isn't about 'the environment'. This is about our survival and the survival of future generations. The environment and our existence are not two separate things, they are one and the same, intricately bound together.

Ultimately, the environment will be fine, the earth will bounce back, it is us that won't survive, no matter how much money is in the bank.

In hope,

Dorothy Varellas.

To Whom it may Concern,

I am writing to express my deep disappointment in the existing climate policies of the Australian Government.

We should commit to a target of 50% by 2020 to have a hope of avoiding dangerous climate change, particularly since new scientific evidence suggests that climate change is happening more rapidly than previously thought. Though this may be expensive, the cost will be much higher if we do not act now.

The weak target undermines efforts to form crucial international agreement. The UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen should be a chance for Australians, through their government, to urge other countries to make strong commitments. We need to do this ourselves to be taken seriously.

The CPRS will do more harm than good and needs to be heavily revised or thrown out. The fact that it actually imposes a floor below which emissions cannot fall is absolutely ridiculous, and the action that individuals and small business take to reduce energy will do nothing to reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions.

I personally feel powerless in the fight against climate change because of these insulting and sickening policies. As an environmentalist, I find the valuation of money over our earth absurd.

Thank you for your time and your representation of the needs and desires of Australians.

Sarah Dunn

When I saw the news the other day regarding large chunks of ice coming adrift from the polar shelf, I knew that the world had left it too late in cutting back greenhouse gas emissions. I still find it amazing that with all the evidence in front of them, politicians still choose to do nothing or not enough.

It needs a strong leader to lead the world in improving the environment. I hope one day I can look back and say that it was Australia's leaders that took that initiative.

Margaret Bowden

The current target of 5-15% is both not high enough or soon enough. We can do better Australia needs to be a leader in this field. I understand difficulties for business but there are many opportunities. They need to be lead in a forward thinking progressive manner which is why I voted for Kevin Rudd, as I know the Liberals are woeful on climate change. Please don't let me regret my decision.

Sharon Hook

The low target of 5-15% set by the Australian government is unacceptable. This not only affects the ecosystems at the polar regions but also the habitats in our own backyards. With the drying climate we will lose the vast majority of our endemic flora and fauna species of mountainous regions and other refugia (e.g., wet gullies, coastal regions etc). I strongly urge the government to consider more responsible targets of reducing greenhouse pollution - particularly that caused by industry and agriculture. I'd also like to see more promotion and subsidies on use of renewable resources in the home (e.g., solar power, solar hot water systems, rainwater tanks etc).

Sincerely,

Dr Melinda Moir

Hi,

I write to ask that in light of new scientific findings which are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought that Australia set a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure that we as a nation do our fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. That Australia act as a role model to other nations; someone willing to be brave and push for the required actions that we need to make globally rather than being one of those short-sighted nations with no respect for the future of current and future generations to come.

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 5 -15% target is abysmal - what is needed is a 50% reduction by 2020 (based on 1990 levels) if we are to tackle climate change head on and genuinely attempt to save such precious natural wonders that Australia hosts such as the Great Barrier Reef...

Please show us the leadership that we want to see!

Sincerely,

Sonya Tirtajaya

Dear Ministers Wong & Garrett

The 5% reduction in emissions targets is too small. If we do so little, other countries will follow suit and do next to nothing as well, and this will undermine crucial international agreements at the conference in Copenhagen.

This is our one and only chance not only to make a real difference to future climate change but also to be a leader in green technology and renewable energy - with great potential to sustain our economy into the future.

We need stronger targets now. Australians will support stronger targets - there is no other way to save the planet from disastrous future climate change.

ninka koc

It is up to you, as our leaders, to ensure that our children aren't left with a terrible legacy because of YOUR refusal to seriously and properly address climate change. It's time to ignore the fossil fuel lobby, and invest in truly sustainable and renewable energy technologies. 50% by 2020 is THE LEAST we should be aiming for in a CPRS. My family & friends don't care what you have to do to make our planet safe for future generations. A complete change to business as usual/rampant consumption is required of our society, and I don't know anybody who isn't willing to do what they have to, to achieve this change. Have some balls. Take the lead. The world will one day thank you for it.

Catherine Manning & family

Please commit to reducing Australias greenhouse pollution levels by more than the 5-15% target. Try to make business more answerable to helping reduce these levels.

Thankyou,

Adam Smith

I write to express my concerns regarding Australia's proposed climate policy and related environmental policies.

I acknowledge that Australia's actions alone will not stop global climate change, however if we take only token action we are in effect abetting climate change.

If we do not take firm action how can we encourage other countries to lower their emissions. We must set large goals (like reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020) in order to stand firm with other countries to allow us to apply pressure to significant polluters.

This means we need to remove the CPRS floor below which emissions cannot fall so everyone can do their part. Consumers like myself will not take action to reduce green house gases if it simply means a polluting industry can take up the slack and make more profit into the bargain.

If we do not take firm action we will have no moral leg to stand on when refugees from Pacific countries come to Australia when their islands sink beneath the sea.

We must ask ourselves why Germany is taking up the use of solar power at a much faster rate than Australia, when we have an abundance of sunshine. Why don't we have well designed houses that need a minimum of air condition which could then easily be solar powered? Why can't I trust that the green power I buy is actually green? Why, if I produce power to feed into the grid, I'm not paid at green power rates (or higher)?

I ask the parliament to take action quickly to seriously address our carbon pollution. It is past time for us to take a leading stance, and if we do not soon we will become linked with the high carbon emitting countries of the world.

Cathryn McCormack

The proposed greenhouse reduction target of 5% is weak and unacceptable. It conveys a spineless will to lead by example and achieve something meaningful. Furthermore it will undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change, including last December's 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.

Stay the course and commit to a greater target to reduce Australia's greenhouse emissions target!

David Leavesley

Dear Senators

I encourage you to seek stronger medium term greenhouse gas reduction targets. By taking a strong stance Australia will be seen to be taking a leadership on this issue and hence will be taken more seriously in climate change negotiations.

Yours sincerely

Richard Alcorn

As a mother and general practitioner I am deeply concerned at the government's current CPRS proposal. Allowing permits to be bought offshore means that as a country it is likely our emissions will increase. Our weak target undermines negotiations in Copenhagen later this year. As the world's largest per capita emitter of CO2 we are morally obliged as a developed wealthy nation to lead the way in combatting climate change. We need a moratorium on new coal fired power stations and coal mines with a move to 100% renewables by 2020 and a just transition to green collar jobs. The science is telling us that we need to be acting now. We have the technology with large scale solar thermal power plants to move away from dirty coal power and with a national gross feed in tariff we can all be generating clean solar and wind power.

The health implications of not acting now include death from heat stress as we have seen over the summer in Victoria(over 300 people died from this), an increase in the spread of mosquito borne diseases including dengue fever and an increase in mental health burden as people struggle with both emergencies like "black saturday"'s firestorms and gradual losses such as the loss of the murray-darling food bowl due to prolonged drought.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Dimity Williams

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

I am concerned about the effects of climate change on our well-being. We must ensure that whatever we do in our efforts to reduce carbon pollution, doesn't simply shift the problem off-shore.

The proposed carbon trading reduction scheme is flawed in 2 important areas. One, it subsidises the major polluters by giving them free credits without an immediate substantial pollution cut. They should be penalised. Job retention should not be a consideration, as the jobs will go eventually, so why not now. With the subsidies, greener jobs could be created.

Two, it relies on "the market", which benefits private corporations, and has no interest in the common good. In light of the current global financial crisis, the further we can remove ourselves from "the market", the better.

We would be better off with a scheme which had a direct, immediate reduction in carbon pollution. The proposed CRTS does nothing to reduce carbon pollution now, so funds should be directed to areas and activities which will achieve a lasting reduction and sustainable industries.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Alabaster

Dear Senators,

Global warming is the most important issue ever faced by the human race. The planet can survive, as it has through many enormous upheavals and changes, but the human race won't if we don't act NOW and act seriously. A target of 50% reduction in emissions by 2020 is the very least we should be aiming at.

The proposed targets are pitifully ineffective to reduce emissions to levels which will enable humans to continue to live on this planet.

We are rapidly running out of time. Scientific research is revealing that climate change is occurring far faster than was previous forecast.

We are already past the tipping point, rapidly heading for the point of no return.

Australians, per capita, are among the worst polluters on the planet. We need to set strong targets to amend this.

I love this planet, but (for environmental reasons) I have chosen not to have children. Those who have children have even more reason to be serious about their future ability to survive - impossible if we don't set and enforce serious targets for reduction of harmful emissions, in particular CO2 and methane.

Under the proposed CPRS, any attempts by small business and individuals to reduce emissions will only succeed in making room for polluting industries to increase their emissions.

Please act responsibly. There is no point 'safeguarding jobs' if we don't have a planet on which to be employed.

We now have a wonderful opportunity to lead the world in alternative technologies, thus creating new jobs and taking advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

For the sake of your children and their children, please take this matter seriously!

If you don't, you will be undermining efforts to form international agreement at the UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen this year.

THIS IS UNBELIEVABLY IMPORTANT. NOTHING HAS EVER MATTERED THIS MUCH BEFORE!

Sincerely,

Rosie Knott

It would have to be one of the highest priorities for the Australian Government to INVEST in alternative energy (and in education). Surely? Not to do so WILL invite Australians to buy alternative energy technologies into the foreseeable future. We have already lost photovoltaic industry to China. Obama will invest in these technologies and that will (along with Denmark for wind power) put us in a non-competitive position.

So, please 1) aim for better targets and 2) invest in bringing them about!

Lee

Dear Senators.

I am writing to ask that you seriously consider the inadequacy of the 5-15% target proposed in the Australian Climate Policy. This is far from adequate! We should be aiming to reduce our greenhouse pollution by 50% - which will necessitate changes to the big polluters such as the coal industry, instead of individual households and small business.

Scientific support of the existence and devastation of climate change should be enough to ensure well designed, sustainable reduction schemes that include renewable energies, are a number 1 priority for the Australian Government. At the moment the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is not nearly sufficient. Time is precious. What are you waiting for??

Again I ask that you set the target higher and make reducing emissions a worthwhile and imposable objective for ALL Australians!

Yours in hope,

Jennifer Lissarrague

1. The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 are far too weak. If the rest of the world was to adopt similar targets Australia would face a future of more frequent and extreme weather events. If we fail to tackle the climate crisis now, we will suffer more deadly bushfires

<http://www.acfonline.org.au/articles/%20/articles/news.asp?news_id=2202#footnote1> [1], costly floods and cyclones.

2. Everyone needs to do their fair share on climate change, including big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change to the tune of \$9 billion in the next three years. That's over \$1000 for every household in Australia. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.

3. Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy, not destroy jobs as the big polluters claim.

<http://www.acfonline.org.au/articles/%20/articles/news.asp?news_id=2202#footnote1> [2]

Yours Jonathan S.

I am so disappointed with the climate change target of 5-15%. I believe that the argument of economic disadvantage is a furphy. Surely it is more efficient/cheaper to harvest solar energy than to dig up coal, transport it half way around the country, burn it, to boil water, to make steam, to turn a turbine.

Australia has an opportunity to become a world leader in renewable technology. Please consider the future of our country's unique natural assets including prime agricultural land, amazing diversity of animals and plants, and of course the Great Barrier Reef; and set a target for renewables which give these assets a chance to be around for future generations.

Yours sincerely

Adam Logan