Dear Senate Committee,

I am deeply concerned that the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme sets targets too low and should be raised to 50% reduction by 2020. I will not repeat the scientific evidence for the need for urgent action. The low targets for carbon reduction are below the levels that will be met by the changes that the general public are prepared to make. The result will be that there will be little incentive for major polluters to change behaviour and hence the scheme will fail.

I feel that public sympathy rests with taking significant action despite the economic difficulties. The public looks to the Federal Government to lead, especially to create sustainable industries.

Yours faithfully

Deborah Marks

I am writing to say that the governments proposed target of a 5% cut to greenhouse gas emissions is inadequate. as a parent I want to be able to look my children in the eye in 30 years time and say that our generation did its best to start tackling this problem. I fear it is already too late but we must act decisively now or the problem may be insoluble in the future. i am prepared to pay extra for proper (20%) cuts between now and 2020.

Frank Stewart

Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020, Australia will suffer terribly from climate change both economically and environmentally, we have a chance to be world leaders in reduction targets and renewables, let's not miss the opportunity!

Dr. Ned Curthoys

Dear Kevin Rudd & Penny Wong

I urge you to stengthen Australia's Carbo Emmitions Target 20% to 80% by 2020 & another 20% by 2030 & another 560% by 2050? .

Please consider these targets by a better Enbviroment in Australia.

Your Sincerely

Jason Andrew Toppin

Please,

for the love of God,

commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020

grace and peace,

Jarrod McKenna

As a supporter of the Rudd Government and a concerned citizen, I would like to see a Climate Policy that contains the provision for higher targets in response to new Scientific information and improved targets from other governments around the world. Germany is spending half it's stimulus package on green technologies. We must do more.

Maria Heenan

The Governments proposed 5-15% target is ridiculously low. I am sick of Australia being at the trailing end of environmental action. I find this situation embarrassing particularly when compared to other countries. Why shouldn't we be showing a world-wide example of good environmental policy?

As an individual I reduce my consumption where possible (walk where possible, drive a Smart, use 100% green power, work from home etc) but under the proposed CPRS none of this helps as industry can then just increase their pollution.

Please do something sensible and do it quickly. Listen to environmental experts advice and not major polluters.

Kind regards, Stewart Kirby

Climate change is the biggest environmental issue humanity has ever faced. If we fail to make deep cuts now, we will leave an impossible legacy for the next generation.

The global financial / economic crisis is not a reason to delay on taking action. Rather, it is an essential part of the solution.

All Australians have a role to play in reducing greenhouse emissions and it is the government's job to ensure everyone - including the energy and transport sectors - do their bit.

A strong target and an emissions reduction scheme that ensures all players participate are needed right now.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Moles

Why is it that the Federal Government are happy to support State Governments that implement projects with clearly better climate alternatives. Take the proposed Wonthaggi desalination plant Victoria is determined to push through against their electoral mandate. Alternatives, of similar capacity, can be sourced at 1/4 the carbon emissions, close to 1/3 the ongoing cost of water, and close to half the implementation cost. See; http://www.watershedvictoria.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/final5optionsnonpotableetpoffset.pdf for the detail.

We then have the situation where four times as many renewable energy offsets will be needed to be tied up in this new infrastructure, rather than 1/4 as many, which would have allowed the other 3/4 to actually reduce our emissions.

Yours,

Neil Rankine.

You cannot have any ecomy at all if you do not a planet that people can live on. Set appropriate targets.

Peter Atherden

As a mother of three children that may have children of their own - the long term consequences of not taking climate change seriously is unethical.

Regards, Rosalie

We can no longer stop climate change. But we must do whatever is humanly possible to reduce the rate of change.

The government's proposed 5-15% target is too low. And it may hurt our economy even in the short term, if other nations impose penalties on our goods because of our low targets.

Australia has more to lose than many others. I refer you to the article 'Surviving in a Warmer World' in New Scientist, 28 Feb 2009.

Senate Inquiry into Goverments Climate Change policy.

I would like to see a stronger and meaningful target set of by the government atleast 30%

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 existing Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme does is to kind to the heavy pollutors at the expense of the community and the enviroment.

Regards

Hayley Crossing

We need as a nation to take this issue seriously and be active in reducing our emissions.

encourage ordinary Australians to be proactive in reducing their carbon footprint and as a government up the expectations

Judy George

Dear Ma'am or Sir,

What, precisely, is being pledged within Australia's 5-15% greenhouse gas reduction targets?

When seriously deep cuts are being called for, something of the order of 10% can hardly be called "deep", in any language! Under these circumstances, I find myself embarassed to identify as an Australian.

Greenhouse gas reduction is not just a local concern; it's not just a federal concern; it behooves EVERYONE ON THE PLANET to participate, for the future of our children and our grandchildren. Vested interests should be relegated to a back seat. I don't want the future of my children and grandchildren put in jeapordy by a few shareholders in some resources company!

So, if every on the planet is responsible, why is it that Australia's federal government is mandating a measly 5% target in greenhouse gas reduction, and what, precisely, does that mean? Even at 5%: I do not want the responsibility for that target to be merely shipped offshore onto the shoulders of third world peoples who can barely afford the added responsibility, with the nett effect that Australian polluters basically get a free lunch, business-as-usual. It's wrong, and it planning for this must stop now. Vastly deeper cuts have been predicted to have exceedingly minor economic consequences. These shallow targets, on the other hand, are going to make the task of avoiding disasterous consequences all the more ridiculously expensive in the not too distant future.

I ride my bike to work and back, 20km each day round trip. I encourage my kids to use less power. These are small gestures. I want Australia to commit to a path to halving its greenhouse gas emmissions within 10 years. I want Australia to stand up and be counted as a leader in the international community when it comes to significant real anti-climate change efforts. I want Australian polluters to be penalised heavily for reflecting so poorly upon the rest of the country, not rewarded for the efforts of the general public with permission to keep burning more and more.

The coal industry is a dinosaur and should be allowed to die a dignified death. "Clean coal" is nothing but speech-fodder and should be banned from any discussion. Put in place appropriate infrastructure to take advantage of our tidal, wave, geo-thermal, solar and wind resources. The rest of the world is laughing at us yet again. Let's put the shoe on the other foot and show the world that we're

What's it to be: stump and pay a small price now, or go Ostrich and leave the penalty to future generations?

Kevin Cousins

I urge our Govt. to live up to pre-election promises re taking decisive action on Greenhouse emissions and finally set a strong target to reduce emissions by starting with our biggest polluters.

Most Australians are prepared to make personal hard choices to reduce their own "carbon footprint" but WHY should they

if the main offenders make no efforts? We will achieve nothing if the big polluters don't come to the party.

PLEASE take real action now. That's what I voted for in the last election. The proposed CPRS is a cop-out to industry. What good will money do us if we can no longer rely on our own agricultural sector because of global warming and increased drought and severe weather patterns?

Please, please, please exercise your leadership and act for the future of Australia and the world NOW and don't be afraid to make those tough decisions.

Cecilia.

I urge the Senate to strongly recommend that Australia sets much stronger targets for green house gas emission reduction

In particular I would urge the Senate to be backing a 20 - 25% reduction in green house gas emissions by 2020...

Yours faithfully

Basil Schur

We as individuals and industry collectively need to take more short / medium term emissions targets pain for longer term climate change gains.

We owe it to the earth, the environment and our children.

Russell White

To the policy makers,

I am deeply saddened by the 5-15% proposed target.

It seems very clear to me that the real issue has been forgotten here. This isn't just about emissions and climate change, this is about living efficiently and sustainably. Even if the earth was not heating up, doesn't it make sense to look for more sustainable ways of living and reduce our overall impact on the land.

I would like to see the government I support, actually set a strong target that will create jobs and sustain our lives on earth. If you set a strong target, it makes sense that you are showing the world that we are the leaders in taking action on climate change and when we achieve a big target, we will show the world just what one nation is capable of.

I see an Australia that could easily set 50% by 2020 and remember the initial transition will be tough, but the jobs won't go, the jobs will evolve to cleaner energy and a renewable energy sector. You must know this? So why won't you commit to what makes sense for everyone, not just worrying about now but the long term future.

My pride in being Australian is fading every time I hear the government taking backward steps on Climate change. I don't want to belong to a country that needs to always rely on others to do something positive. I want my Australia to be a role model not a follower.

If the labour party is for jobs and families, prove it by setting 50% by 2020.

Kelvin Andersen

Dear Kevin, Penny, Peter and everyone I happily voted in!

Please do whatever you can to strengthen our commitment to action which which slow climate change. I, and everyone I know, are prepared for you to make policy which directly impacts on us all. Although no doubt it will be hard and may involve a drop in our standard of living now, please do what needs to done. Please make Australia a leader among the nations in showing the way to seriously address climate change. Don't waste this moment in history.

I would happily forego the $900 stimulus boost if I knew that money was going into kick starting a competitive world leading industry in wind or solar energy.

You are - I hope- the experts in this: in how to make effective policy.Please be bold and decisive, so that our future is not a disaster fuelled by governmental inaction.

Please act on our behalf. We need you to.

Yours Sincerely, in some desperation,

Sally Morgan.

Why can't the Australian government see the long term economic benefits of new environmental technologies, instead of dragging us into the past with old fuels, outdated thinking and a lack of action that future Australian generations will deplore.

We could be a world leader in sustainable and environmentally friendly energy. Instead we give big polluters public money to continue on their merry way.

I changed my vote from Green to Labor to get rid of the Howard government, and am bitterly disappointed at the Rudd Government's lack of action, vision and moral fiber.

Unless we see significant change, I will be voting for, and campaigning for a change.

Regards,

Ray Leung

I'm disappointed in the weak response the Rudd government has made on climate change. The Australian people elected this government expecting strong leadership and sensible change. With the weak targets and unimaginative policy initiatives so far, this doesnt seem to be happening. In light of the GFC, government is scared to make unpopular decisions. However if the viability of the environment is compromised, not just jobs and businesses but human life on this planet will fail.

Your initiatives need to have preventing this catastrophe as their goal, not just achieving a manageable CPRS - which will inevitably be a compromise position.

In particular

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

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

Alice

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

Regards

Deidre Reid

I appreciate the economic problems with which your government is faced, but I believe the electorate put you in so that you would make the hard decisions about this problem. It seems that, once again, an elected government has been hijacked by big business.

It's obvious from reading all the scientists' latest reports that climate change is happening much faster than originally predicted. World government's must make a concerted effort in Copenhagen in December and I, personally, would like to see Australia in the forefront of important decisions made - however painful they're going to prove to be.

I was proud to have supported Labour in order to oust Howard, but am seriously thinking my future votes will have to support the Green parties, who seem to be sincerely committed to doing something positive to achieve essential targets.

Eileen Whitehead

To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my concern at the very low targets that have been set for the CPRS. Whilst I accept that there will be political difficulties with setting higher targets, we need stronger targets to immediately reduce our emissions and should be showing the world our true commitment to addressing climate change.

I also think that the scheme should reward those making voluntary reductions in emissions, as well as enfoccing mandatory targets. Please amend the policy to include incentives for emissions reduction at all levels - and reward helpful resident behaviour.

This is our chance to act decisively - please ensure a strong commitment from Australia in addressing this global issue.

Kind regards,

Mat Hardy

G'day,

I'm writing to urge the government to raise their 5-15% target to 50%. I voted you in because I was assured strong action. I'm yet to witness that and I'm starting to feel cheated.

Set a strong target and do some good. This isn't time for politics, it's time for action.

With hope,

Dylan Fogarty-MacDonald

Your weak action in regard to climate change and capitulation to the polluters is totally irresponsible. We need pollies who who can take a strong lead and implement measures to address the seriousness of the climate problems.

Changes to our environment are occuring with alarming speed and we do not have time to fiddle with things around the edges or to try and keep all parties with divergent interests happy with a little for everyone.

Nothing, not the economy, jobs, roads, manufacturing, exports or anything else, is more important than saving our planet.

Please listen to what the people want and to what the scientists are telling you and take action.

Yours sincerely,

L. Price

Hi

I have been very disappointed with the government's weak target of 5 - 15% reduction of greenhouse gases, particularly as this was one of the reasons I voted for the current government.

If we want our children and their children to have some kind of future, we have to pull out all the stops now! There is no more time for procrastination ...climate changes are happening quicker than previously thought. The CPRS scheme proposed by the government will do nothing to curb the major polluters of Australia - large industries - be real!

We need some strong targets and a well-designed scheme to help us avoid contributing to the worsening effects of climate change - please honour your election promises.

Thank you,

your sincerely

Sue Maxwell

We face the greatest threat our existence since the Cold War. And we worry about money. We spend billions of dollars on trying to prop up an economic system in collapse and yet say that this same crubbling system is worth risking the planet for. Don't be dumb. Be strong.

Robbie O'Brien

Senate Select Inquiry on climate policy

A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought and the the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.I addition the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme and ultimately will be do more harm than good and over-compensates high level polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

As the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. this is a key problem associated with any cap and trade scheme and action by individuals will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Key players in this debate such as James Hansen in the US have indicated that a tax on carbon is the only logical step to take and in setting a strong target (something like 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels) with a carbon tax will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and also help to refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

It is time for Australia to provide moral leadership in this area rather than adopt a wait and see approach as this is crucial for future generations.

Regards

Ron Nicholls

The coal lobby will tell you anything to save their industry. That's fair enough, it's their job. We're talking about saving the human habitat here, not one particular industry. Your decisions have the power to renew and sustain the existence of our species, or send it to hell. What a privilege!

Make the right decision. Impose a clear 50% target by 2020. Make it possible for additional action by individuals to increase this amount. Use legislation to make renewable energy industries viable and watch the jobs get created. The cola miners protested in England when Thatcher closed the pits, but looking back they are glad now they don't work in that environment. Have some vision, move Australia to a green energy economy, create jobs secure our future and save the planet while you're doing it.

Do you have the guts?

Michael Macken

My submission on the Government's climate policy is that it needs to be much stronger. Australia may not contribute greatly in global terms to greenhouse gases but it must show the way by reducing its harmful practices. In fact this could be turned to a positive as Australia has the capacity to lead the world in producing green technology. This would create rather than reduce job prospects.

Individuals and communities must be encouraged in their efforts to reduce carbon emissions. They must be convinced that their actions make a difference. Hence Australia needs a scheme that rewards all those who make the effort to significantly reduce their carbon footprint.

I have confidence that our parliamentary representatives can, if they work together, come up with a much better scheme than the one currently proposed.

Jeff Wild

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

All the latest scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. And now the Antartic ice is following suit.

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

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

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

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

Please reconsider the targets, for all our sakes.

Bernard Peasley

I do understand that with the global financial crisis the global warming debate seems like yesterday's problem. But it is tomorrow's problem, and potentially the only one that matters. Economic cycles come and go, climate cycles c.....o.....m.....e a.....n.....d g.....o.....

I believe the Australian people understand the dangers and despite hardship are prepared to sacrifice for very long term benefit. Set targets commensurate with what the world really needs to achieve to save the environment as we know it. Lead and we will follow.

gareth

Dear legislators

Please think of the generations to come and take a strong stand on climate change. A target of 5-15% is insufficient to tackle greenhouse pollution.

Yours sincerely

Gwenda Johnston

The Rudd Government's CPRS is little more than a joke.

The Government was elected with a mandate to aggressively target carbon emissions. The electorate has been taken for a ride...

Targets must be higher (50% by 2020), be tough on carbon emitters, large and small, be generous to those who reduce carbon emission, and must encourage the development of large scale, base load renewable energy, such as solar power.

If you think base load reewable energy is not possible, then read Scientific American: http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-solar-grand-plan

Do the right thing by The World, Australian voters, and most importantly, their children.

Dr Gavin Doolan

the most important issue facing this generation is climate change. The government's target is far too low. Austrailans have the highest carbon foot print per capita of any nation - we must change and give a stong message to other countries to follow suit.

We need to be investing in sustainable forms of power and taking radical action on our water sources to conserve them.

We do not have time to waste.

sue todd

Climate change is the defining issue of this generation. Long after economic and share market fluctuations have faded into the tediously long history of such things, climate change will be with us.

Australia must do all it can to reduce carbon emissions. Our arid continent stands to be one of the most seriously affected by it, and the ongoing droughts, fires, and massive floods are harbingers of what's to come.

Instead of futilely clinging to an unsustainable and costly past, we must embrace a future of green technology and smarter energy use, rather than simply more.

I have invested a substantial amount of my own money in solar hot water, solar electricity, an efficient car, and insulation of my home. I want that to produce a net total reduction in emissions, not simply subsidise industry to pollute more.

H. Pierce

Significant polluters are given a free kick before the game starts - why ?

Solar, wind, geothermal, wave and tidal methods will develop to something special one day. In the meantime why discard nuclear as a baseload option ? It works and its waste can be managed.

The present approach has no urgency about it and WE ALL need to tackle climate change now.

Ron Murrell

The Australian governments climate change targets are too weak and do not represent the majority opinion. Kevin Rudd and Labour were voted in to do something to change Australia's record on climate change and do something that would achieve the real goal of preventing further climate change.

Labour needs to reconsider their whole Carbon pollution reduction scheme and make a real commitment to people and the planet by investing in renewable energy and fairly charging polluters and setting strong targets well above 15% to really make a difference to climate change for all our sakes and the sake of our children.

Dr BJ Mayer

All observers except those peverse climate change deniers that grab many headlines are only too aware that climate change science indicates things are at the worse end of the spectrum for almost every parameter. The rate of change, the potential seriousness of change, the predicted rises in sea leavels. And all the while global emissions rise. Australia only looks good due to the once off effect of reduced land clearing in Qld.

The target must be far higher than the miserable 5 to 15%, and the dishing out of free permits must be greatly reduced.

Finally it is vital that the proposed system is fixed so that the actions of individuals to reduce their carbon polution are not in vain. With the proposed cap and trade my own reductions will just be taken up by some energy intensive industry.

This is too important to play politics with - it is about the lives of future generations and of survival of Earth as we know it.

David Gill

As world leaders in air pollution per head we need to show leadership in setting reduction targets, promptly. The Government's 5 to 15% target is pathetic as are the calls for delaying it due to the 'economic crisis'

John Gourlay

South Yarra, Vic..

We need action on Climate Change urgently.

We are in the grip of a severe drought, which I am convinced is caused by Climate Change.

I know we have had severe droughts before, but not to the extent of this one.

No water, no rain, and unusually intense heat. Even in autumn, very hot, then very cold.

Marie Dullard.

I am writing to protest against the Rudd Government's inadequate response to climate change and to demand, as a citizen, that the government take stronger action on my behalf.

I want the Government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

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.

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

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

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

Lola Hill

Hi

The targets set are insufficient to create real sustainable change. We are recovering from the economic crisis caused by cowboys in Wall Street, we can do the same for the economic impacts of tougher action on climate change.

Please take action on this and understand that the present generations and future ones will thank you for it.

Chris Thomas (aged 57)

Things are advancing at the very high end of predictions.

I want the Government to adopt a sense of urgency about this issue - on a par with the sense of urgency worldwide about the financial crisis.

I voted for Kevin Rudd on this issue.

Remember, no climate - no economy.

Annie Wicks

Also, what are you doing about the Prince of Wales' iniative to value rainforests more alive than dead - and help the countries where the last great stands of rainforest exist in the world. They are a world resource and we should do our bit to preserve them.

As the world's biggest polluters per head of population, we owe it to mankind to be serious about reducing climate change. We must collect more sunshine energy in our landscape than any other country. Invest in efficiently converting this primary energy source for our needs, and stop selling polluting coal.

Graeme Aitken

Climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. This is shown by the steady stream of new scientific findings. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

The Government's 5-15% target is most inadequate and we will not avoid dangerous climate change. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

Ffionnan Brooke-Watson.

5-15% as a target to reduce greenhouse gases is ridiculously low. Scientists are telling us in order to avoid catastrophic climate change we need to reduce it by 50% by 2020.

Our weak targets do not show Australia as a leader but infact undermine the efforts to get an international agreement together that works.

The CPRS is a farce and just rewards the big polluters and gives no credit to individuals who save energy.

In this economic downturn we could be creating vast numbers of jobs in the renewable area.

Please look beyond the politics. If we get this wrong there is no going back for us and our children and grandchildren.

Rosemary Johnson

Please add this email to the pile requesting urgently that Australia rise to the Rudd government's assurance that Australia would be 'punching above its weight' with regard to environmentally responsible action.

5 - 15% reduction in emissions is NOT ENOUGH. I find myself feeling very disheartened and disappointed by this conservative target, where I have been truly hopeful and excited about rising to the challenge in the past. Sadly, I am also questioning the value of my current (considerable) personal and financial investments, given the current structure of the CPRS and it's implications.

Please harness the enthusiasm, social care and creativity of this country by setting a standard we can all feel proud to rise to, and which will ensure that we have truly done our best to meet the pivotal challenge of this generation, for the benefit of ourselves and future generations.

Sincerely,

Belinda Lloyd

It takes strong leaders to effect real change. The world is full of followers and Australia is no exception.

You have the responsibility to make the changes necessary for Australia to work towards sustaining this planet.

It would be short-sigthed to be more concerned about getting re-elected than about making real change. Don't stand back now that you've been given a mandate for change by those of us who placed our faith in you! Please!

If you set a strong target it might cost some votes, yes, but it might also gain you plenty of votes from the Green side of the spectrum. It should NOT be about gaining votes though!

Taking the time to build up a strong renewable energy industry will ensure plenty of jobs in future and could help Australia recover from the economic crisis it is immersed in at the moment.

It would make so much sense for large corporations to be held accountable in the same way that individuals are. Creating exemptions for emissions by industry makes a laughing stock of the government as they have so clearly been bought! Look around you at what is happening in other countries. Do you honestly want Australia to become just another corrupt country? Will you now be bending to industry despite the promises to work towards a sustainable future?

Let's not look like fools at the UN Conference in Copenhagen, but stand as the strong proud country we ought to be, leading the way in change against climate change.

Thank you

Elsa Raubenheimer

To the Senate:

The 5% compulsory target baffles many people as it will not prevent the worst ravages of climate change from utterly destroying our environment. Nor does it send any kind of message whatsoever that we are taking the issue seriously by acting responsibly at home, regardless of our overall percentage contribution to the problem. John Howard's government in part failed because as total pragmatists, they could not grasp the concept of 'lead by example'. They accordingly had no moral authority on most issues. Why can't we set such an example, be tough on ourselves and in doing so inspire others to jump on board with serious legislation backed by science?

Thanks,

Ben Carew

The Governments present policy of a target of 5-15% reduction is not realistic.It seems that every day we get news of an accelarating trend in global warming.Australias weak target is undermining efforts to get a realistic international agreement and must be improved.

Yours faithfully

D A Clarke

I would like to draw attention to the Governement action or lack in climate change issues.

While rcognising that these are difficult times, I myself lost my job when I got cancer a yer ago and now cannot reenter the workforce easily.

However the needs might be to look at the small details, the targets are important as it assisting people understand the changes. I believe that we should be spending some dollars with artists projects as a part of the knowledge.

make the targets more reall. please.

lisa

The Government's 5-15% target is a craven response to an ecological disaster staring us in the face. Ostrich-like decisions like this are along the lines of 'if we pretend to do something perhaps it will go away of its own accord.' I for one did not vote for the Rudd Government to see it grovel to industry lobby groups who only have a narrow focus and total lack of vision.

In fact climate change has presented the Government with the opportunity for Australia to become a world leader in renewable energy technology, an opportunity that was shamefully wasted by the Howard Government. I never expected to see Rudd follow in the footsteps of that mediocre loser.

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

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

Sincerely

John Walters

The Government's 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous levels of climate change. Australia should commit to reducing greenhouse pollution by at least 50% by 2020.

Peter and Judy Smith

To the attention of the Inquiry on climate policy,

I cannot believe such weak action, and in fact INaction, prevails at this point. NOTHING should stand in the way of immediate and strong action in an attempt to keep this planet habitable!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Pat Grainger

I wish to register my dissapointment in the Rudd Government's inadequate 5-15% CPRS target. Australia's opportunity to take a progressive stance on climate change and desmonstrate to the world that all Australian's are behind this movement has passed us by, but it is not too late to ensure our CPRS is adequate and inspires other countries around the world to do the same.

To avoid the devestating effects of climate change, we need to increase our target to reduce greenhouse pollution by at least 50%. The current target of simply will not suffice to make a positive environmental impact and undo the effects of human interference and consumption or resources. The current scheme also needs to be re-evaluated to ensure it does not reward major polluters, particularly at the expense of the community and the environment.

More funding needs to be used towards renewable energy projects. Unsustainable development and resouce use will lead us and future generations to dire straits.

Please provide an example to the world by making Australia a progressive country in relation to climate change action.

Regards,

Richelle Roberts

After 10 years of political inaction on climate change we now have the opportunity to pursue genuine change, but the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme as proposed by the Rudd Government is poorly designed, providing excessive levels of compensation to major polluters at the expense of our community. We need strong carbon emission targets and a well designed scheme to support the environment and provide a clear and strong example to the international community.

I am deeply concerned that my efforts and those of my friends, family and community will not be used to establish further reductions in greenhouse emissions. It is offensive that these efforts may only make room for industry to increase their emissions.

I implore the Government to take a stronger response on climate change.

Dr Allyson Mutch

Dear Federal Parliament, neither coal nor nuclear energies are safe or sustainable. Australia must, with other countries, move to a genuinely-sustainable energy base, drawing on solar, wind & sensitively designed hydroelectric sources, if we are to prevent a climate catastrophe.

Yours sincerely,

Damien Pitts

I expect that the Government take positive action to help prevent dangerous climate change. I would like to see our Government commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% on 1990 levels by 2020.

We don't even have to depend on scientific findings (valid as they are) to demonstrate that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The evidence is before our eyes. It is disturbing to know that the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

It is bitterly disappointing to voters such as myself that Australia has compromised its promised leadership in the area of climate change policy by setting such a weak target. Our poor target is undermining efforts to get agreement internationally. We must increase our target before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

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

As a citizen of this country, I expect Australia to do its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change by setting a strong target with a well-designed carbon reduction scheme which will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

J.Dance

Future Australians need a more urgent and comprehensive response to climate change. We have to refocus our efforts. We can't have an effective economy unless we better protect our environment and a 5-15% target will not suffice to do so.

Patricia Healy

Lets make a better vision in enviromental management.

Lift the bar. Make a better world by a tougher enviromental KPI.

-or die not doing it.

Trevor Flett

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

The CPRS currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme. The scheme design overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Toni Tod.

Whoever read this should not think 12 months ahead or even 12 years as the damage already done wull take more than a 100 years to repair

Forget the money it cost if you have money but nowhere to live you have a problem

Regards

John Lefel

The Rudd governments proposal for a 5% reduction in greenhouse emissions is grossly inadequate. It shows their policy to be one of talk not action. As a world leader on climate change research Australia has a responsibility to be setting the pace of change. It is not as if we lack the knowledge or do not understand the implications of climate change. Why arent we leading the world in the development of alternate energy? Why is this government locking us into being coal and sheep farmers? Please reconsider the targets for greenhouse gas emissions, and be a leader.

Sincerely

John Walton

Dear Inquiry, I, like many citizens wish to emphasise the need for a stronger target on emissions in the light of the urgent need to address climate change, both nationally and internationally!

yours sincerely,

Jane Bullen

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

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

Please make our efforts count

Carole Sarvis

Australia needs to have a realistic climate change policy, that is realistic for the environment. If we have a weak policy, as is suggested by the govenmnet at the moment, it is just delaying a worse alternative for jobs while at the same time doing perhaps irreparable damage to the planet. Polluters should not be compensated anywhere near to the level they will be. They need to be forced to take greater responsibility for reducing the effects of climate change. Individuals in particular, should have their contribution as a positive thing. At the moment it has the opposite effect - that of subsidising pollution for the bigger polluters.

We need change.

We need far stronger targets.

We need stronger government.

We need a delivery on Kevin Rudds promise for positive change.

Sincerely,

Les Landau

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. There are many more but they are the two that strike me as the most important reasons to reconsider Australia's response to Global Warming,

Good luck.

Peter Fock

I am writing to state my opposition to the Governments current carbon emission reduction targets of 5-15%. This target is clearly too low to either make a difference in the quest to avoid dangerous climate change, or to demonstrate leadership that can be followed by other nations whose commitment to carbon reduction is needed.

Scientific data is growing in evidence suggesting that much larger carbon emission reductions are needed world wide, and Australia should set an example in this regard.

Additionally, Tthe current CPRS should not compensate industrial polluters as it currently does. The full impact on their effect on climate change needs to be reflected in their operating costs, thus helping pave the way for more environmentally benign practice and green economic development.

I believe the current strategy should be scrapped and a much more effective reduction target of 50% compared to 1990 levels by 2020 should be introduced. Carbon intensive industries such as coal and aluminium production should not be compensated to continue to pollute.

Yours Sincerely,

Stephen Berry

The current recession is providing us with ' a breathing space' as less gas etc is thust into the atmosphere as world industrial activity falls;

This gives the world an opportunity to do MORE not less: we need more aggressive targets across the board. To invest in switching our power generation to more sustainable sources ; in reducing our dependence on fossil fuels; to invest in rail infratructure (the south west line in Sydney for example) which will provide a less polluting alternative when the economy does recover ... these are constructive tasks with long-reaching benefits .. not short-term 'flash cash' to spend on imported goods but more highly directed for maximum gain in the longer term.

and perhaps encourage Australians to think of their carbon footprint in terms of food and other goods consumption ..

lots to do, so little time to do it ; Malke the most of this downturn!

elaine newby

Please take stronger action to help save our planet. Please become a leading nation in reducing carbon emissions and encouraging everyone to do so.

Please do not give into the powerful coal and energy lobbies. You are the only ptotection available to ordinary people

Rex and June Thompson

Penny Wong tries to argue that a 5-15% reduction is actually a 30% reduction on what would happen if there was no target.

This is just playing with numbers - the planet will not forgive us just because the target is tough - its a question of what the environment can handle. We need to rely on the advice from scientists and not bsuiness people who have a clear vested short term interest.

25% is the absolute minimum recommended by the UN science panel.

Jon

I am a doctor working in emergency medicine, and I can see that this proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is an inadequate response to a potentially catastrophic emergency. I don't wait until I know for certain every detail of why someone has become critically ill before I try to do anything about it - in fact in my position that would be negligent. Please take the scientists seriously and think about setting stronger targets for reducing carbon pollution. Even if it proves politically unpopular in the short term, you may find you sleep better at night!

Yours sincerely and in hope,

Dr Joanna Wood.

Climate change must be stabilized at all cost. If we don't act now decisively the cost will be far greater or even irreversible. We should commit to reducing greenhouse pollution at least 50% by 2020.

I am 79 and installed Solarheat and roof fans to get rid off the hot air in the roof. So I am not only talking but acting as well.

Andrew Partos

There is no doubt that the globe is warming - stark evidence of collapse of a huge ice shelf in Antartica was presented on ABC TV just this week, for example. I believe that it is man-made, due to steep (measured) rises in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, but, even if not, the "precautionary principle" demands that we act to lower carbon emissions just in case. We owe it to future generations. Otherwise, more of Australia could become virtually uninhabitable by humans! Even though Australia dose not cause most of the dangerous emissions, it gives rise to more per capita than most countries. We owe it to others less fortunate as well as to our descendants to take a lead in cutting carbon emisions as far as we can. We should set a standard that the US and China would feel morally duty-bound to match or better. Please examine all legislation in this area so that it does as well as we can in cuts to carbon emissions. Yes, we can!

jock. churchman

What are we going to tell our children about this?

I am prepared to pay more for items such as food, electrical energy and petrol to heavily subsidise the massive infrastructure changes that are needed very quickly to reverse our contribution to climate change.

There is no doubt that we must try.

Ross Young

Subject:Australia's climate change target is woefully inadequate and embarassing and dangerous.

I believe in the work of the folks at 350.org.

We are already well over 350ppm CO2. We'll never bring it down with feeble targets.

I like to think that we Australians are a relatively reasonable group. Let's how we are and if we are going to make a mistake let it be on the side of caution - on the side of life on earth, not corporate interests.

Sincerely

J Young

I would rather wear the cost of stronger action on climate policy, than cause more pain for future generations by taking the easier way out.I believe that the target should be much higher than 5-15% - more like 50%

Yours sincerely, Ingrid McKenna

The target the Rudd Government have set for reducing greenhouse gas pollution is grossly inadequate. It is well recognised in the scientific community (of which I am a member) that we need to reduce our carbon emissions much more than a paltry 5% if we are to avoid the worst case scenarios of climate change.

Although it is to be applauded that the Rudd Government are introducing a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme after so many years of inaction by the previous Governemnt, it is to be deplored that the target set for reductions is so low, and that large emitters are not forced to reduce their emissions.

The scheme should be introduced and the cross parties should support it in principle, for if they do not we will get further delays in getting a scheme up and running. As the Stern Report has stated, the faster we act the better chance we have of reducing the worst imnpacts of Climate Change

Yours sincerely

Greg Howell B.Sc., M.Sc., MRACI

I think I remember Kevin Rudd buying votes on promises of committment to the future of Australia, and the world's precious environment, feel-good stuff like that. Lame, empty promises it seems, as the recently set 5-15% pollution reduction target clearly demonstrates. It is absolutely pathetic, and I feel ashamed.

Aussies adore the outdoors. Whether it be for work, or leisure, we spend a lot of our time outside. Our beaches are still mostly clean, as is the air in most parts of Australia. But we won't be insulated from the world indefinitely. And we need to stand for what we really want, for ourselves, and for people in the future. Because deep down, we don't really want money. And money is all that is in the way of this climate debate.

What we want, but mostly take for granted, is fresh air, water, healthy food, and shelter. And a stable, mostly predictable environment to live in. To have a modicum of hope for this, we must commit to reducing Australia'a greenhouse pollution 50% or more by 2020. And we must, for once, cease to think about lining our pockets.

My father has a large apple growing business in Western Australia. We are currently dependent on polluting transport such as trucks, energy in the form of power for cool storage, packing, farm vehicles, water pumps and more. However, we have begun using electric forklifts, and are looking into alternative power sources such as solar. Even to cover our entire cool storage roof. But how expensive all this "greening" of business can be. How is it worth it, many ask, and we should we bother? We amble along, content to leave urgent change 'til tomorrow. Left in the hands of average Jo and Jayne, radical change can look more like labored evolution.

How slow we move! The government must act urgently to make a target, regulate polluters and equally, look for ways to foster innovation and private enterprise in so-called "green" sectors. The economy will not fall over...some industries will fall by the way side and new industries will mushroom to tackle climate change and dramatically reduce Australia's contribution to greenhouse gases.

I want to be able to say that Australia sets a benchmark for other countries to look to. We are the sunniest country in the world. Where is are bloody solar innovation??? Shame, our innovators left to Calafornia. They had no government support.

Meanwhile, a bio-mass plant has been approved for my local country town, Manjimup. I would not have thought that possible under this government. But of course, due consultation has taken course. The EPA has decided it won't do too much harm. And not a word even said in the streets about it. Everyone distracted by Kevin Rudd's rediculous "economic stimulus" pocket money.

For too long, we have selfishly said to ourselves, "what will this little car trip matter?", or "I care, but there's just no alternative right now".

My message is, KRudd and co, how's about a cup of concrete to harden up that weak target you came up with?

Just make sure it's not "green" concrete.....wouldn't want to do something that aligns with election promises now would you?

Lucinda Giblett

We have gone past the tipping point and the evidence is the collapse of the Murrsy Darling River System, there is a 800km and growing Blue Green Alge sludge on the Murray endagering major towns and NO water in the dams to send a flush down the river to break it up.

There has not been enough inflows in to the Murray Darling to cover evaporation ket alone give a decent flush that is required to remove the natural build up of toxins.

Until Climate change and population control is raised above economics then we are only going down the slippery slope.

We need a controls similar to those that were brought in during WW11 and not the silly nonsense that the government is stuffing around with.

Lindsay Leake

I have always cared about the environment, and have been deeply concerned about climate change for over a decade. I've done my small bit - bought green electricity for my home, switched off appliances at the power point and walked instead of driven when I could...I've even written several plays with environmental themes (I'm a children's playwright) that have reached reasonably large audiences. But I've never kidded myself that any of this would make even the slightest bit of difference, unless the people who actually have power - the leaders of our nation and of every other nation - were prepared to take action. And when I say action, I mean powerful action...not half-hearted, sitting on the fence kind of action, but action which might actually stop, or at least slow down, what at this stage seems the inevitable demise of our beautiful planet.

Please, I beg of you, our government - be that kind of leader. Make the action you take against climate change REAL action, and be the government which future generations will look back upon with pride and admiration, not anger and disbelief.

Thank you for listening,

Sally Hardy.

All Australia is doing is leaving our children and grandchildren a much bigger problem.

We should, and must, take stronger action now to reduce carbon emissions.

Solar power must have a greater part to play in Australia's

energy needs.

Please act positivly now!

Grace and Ernie Brand

Attention: Senate Inquiry on Climate Policy and Exposure Draftof CPRS Legislation

The Greenhouse Gas reduction targets of 5-15% are completely inadequate to avoid dangerous levels of climate change.

Whilst I appreciate the 'political heat' that the global financial crisis has created, it cannot obscure the fact that climate change is very, very real and has the potential to be far more damaging in the medium to long term than the GFC will be.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme needs wholesale review - I respect that it is a starting point and I am glad about that, but a poorly designed system that panders to large emitters has the potential to drive regressive outcomes not the positive ones we so desperately need.

As a voter, I am extremely concerned about climate change and this is one of the issues that impacts strongly on my voting behaviour.

Yours sincerely

Tania Brown

With the sea ice melting much sooner than thought last week, now is the time to take this as the warning sign it is, and do something.

Why do you always worry so much about big business - they are the ones who are making all the money, at what cost? At the cost of our wellbeing, all in the name of more and more profits.

Please increase our target for greenhouse pollution reduction NOW. DON'T WAIT ANY LONGER - WE JUST CAN'T AFFORD TO.

Regards

Virginia Giles

In the media we are continually being made aware of new scientific findings showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. It is my understanding that the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. Australia must have a policy that leads the world in reducing carbon pollution. And it must be actively engaged in persuadung other nations to take swift action.

Diana Gourley

The GFC has given the government a great opportunity... to stimulate green industries... to change our reliance on growth, growth and more growth... to be a leader among nations... to innovate.

Solar collectors should be installed on all government buildings, and when installed on homes, should not be a "let off" for polluting power plants. The industry should be subsidised and promoted by the government, this would help across the board, from alleviating green house gas production to creating employment and export opportunities.

A clever stimulus one would think.

Glyn Smith

Dear Senators

A reduction of greenhouse gases of 5 to 15% by 2020, that is not acceptable, what message does that give to developing countries, especially those in the Pacific, which are already struggling with a raising sea level, increasing cyclons and floods and droughts. Please listen to the scientists, not the coal tycoons!

H.Gfeller

I urge the Government to reconsider the decision to set a 5% - 15% target for greenhouse emissions by 2020. This target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

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

Please, I implore you to set a stronger target - this issue is way too important to be soft on the target. We won't get a second chance.

Yours sincerely,

Yvette Watt

The "greenhouse" effect of CO2 and related chemicals has been known since the 1930's (when the chemistry was demonstrated) and the changes to earth's atmosphere has been shown since the 1950's. The recent science is showing increasing impacts on climate and every change has appeared at the "top end" of predictions.

The weak targets set by the government seems to indicate that the short term interests of the coal industry and the CMFEU and AWU are taking precedence over the future of this country.

If the current targets are maintained then it is highly probable that life between the 40 degree latitudes will become virtually untenable, and the acidification of the oceans will be a major threat to all ocean life. There is a high risk that feedback processes will become irreversible and the scenarios are then horrible to contemplate.

While it is constantly argued that Australia's contribution to greenhouse gasses is small in total (though large in per head terms) this does not adequately take into account the amount of greenhouse gasses produced overseas with our carbon (from coal and gas).

Australia has undertaken world-leading action to seek to address the financial crisis, in spite of the fact that our economic impact is small on a world scale. It is the least we should expect in addressing the environmental crisis.

If the government is too spineless to take on the polluting industries, why should it expect me to take action when, after all my individual contribution makes no diference on a world scale!

Worse, if I do take action, the way that Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) as proposed sets a floor on the fall of emissions effectively means that actions of individuals like myself (with solar PV, solar hot water, passive house design, low power use and so on) effectively only allows more room for industry to increase emissions.

It seems to me that the sum total of the proposed actions will result in serious damage to our environment, and the only bright spot in the future is that this damage will happen quickly enough that the politicians and industry leaders who have produced this result will still be alive to be held accountable for their gross negligence.

Paul Strickland

We are appalled by the weakness of the Government's 5%-15% carbon reduction target. Big Business has obviously seduced the Labor Government and got their own way. The breakaway of the Wilkinson Ice Shelf signals that we do not have time for timorous targets! The target should be 50% by 2020. All the other international pollies will rejoice and respond by proposing weak targets of their own, since they will feel Australia's action has let them off the hook!

David & Margaret Caldwell

History has shown that committing to strong targets has NEVER cost as much as projected, but instead has led to innovation and often cost savings.

Given the potential future global market it makes good economic sense to push these targets now so Australia will be leaders. Oh and by the way it will save us a lot of hassle when climate change bites quickly and deeply.

You know you have a commitment to lead Australia - make the targets strong for a strong future!

Dr Phil Dooley

we have got to cover every aspect of improving and reversal of the damage that is being done. Companies must cease their pollution as it is now, otherwise there will be no profit lines for any one to consider, this is not alarmist, but obvious and scientifically being proved. The targets overall as they now are totally in-adequate. what about the Future!!

I care, do you? Sincerely, Lorraine Alford

The Government's 5-15% target is woefully inadequate. For the sake of future generations, please listen to what the Australian public want and take action now to ensure that a strong target is set and an effective CPRS scheme is introduced.

Please also ensure that voluntary action taken by individuals and small businesses to reduce energy do not simply benefit the big polluters. Those of us in the fortunate position to be able to afford to install solar hot water and photovoltaic systems do not wish our efforts (and investment) to be in vain in the fight to combat climate change.

Victoria Heywood

Dear Senators,

I am writing to express my concerns with the Federal Government's proposed Climate Policy and Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

The proposed 5% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020 unconditional target is much too low. The latest scientific evidence shows that climate change is happening much faster than was previously thought, and we must set a strong target and take the measures necessary to achieve it as soon as possible.

By failing to set a strong target, the Government is undermining our global credibility and efforts to form international agreements. It must be improved before the Copenhagen UN Conference on Climate Change. Economic modelling shows that reducing our greenhouse emissions significantly will actually be good for our economy overall as new industries in renewable energy grow and develop. We must not let the downturn in some heavily-polluting industries prevent us from doing the right thing for the Australian economy as a whole, not to mention the global environment.

I am also concerned that the draft CPRS provides a lot of compensation in the form of free permits to liable entities, including the electricity industry, lowering their incentive to reduce emissions. I am particularly concerned that the cap does not take into account the actions taken by community and small businesses to reduce emissions, again reducing the incentive for industry to reduce their emissions.

I urge you to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Woodgate

The draft CPRS legisation will not guarantee to reduce Australia's emissions; instead merely promising to very modestly reduce the number of allocable permits. This is inconsistent with the message from the global scientific community, who warn that runaway climate change is almost upon us. The physical evidence of anthopongenic climate change is overwhelming, irrefutable, and terrifying. We ignore these stark warmings of eminent climatologists at our peril and to the detriment of future generations and biodiversity on our planet.

In terms of market mechanisms, and business-as-usual politics, the message is simple: this approach will not work. The European Carbon Trading Scheme is in the process of collapsing for the 2nd time. Indeed, the whole global economy is in obvious deep trouble, and cannot be relied on to save itself, let alone the biosphere. The global response to the global economic crisis should serve as an indictation of the type of solution necessary to save us from runaway climate change: unprecidented gloabal cooperation and direct government intervention.

In Australia, one of the highest polluting nation per capita in the world, this means we need very strong emissions reduction targets of 50% or more in the next decade. This is obviously an end to business as usual, and implies a rapid transition for our energy sector, from coal to renewable energy. This target also means an effective end to our trajectory of hyper-consumption, and a shift to a culture of conservation of resources. This requires huge leadership from governments and is the antithesis of the climate denialist philosophy that underpins the draft CPRS legislation.

These targets are also non-negotiable, because the laws of physics are non-negiotable; the disintegration of ice sheets, desertification, and extreme weather events are non-negiotable. Either we act, or we will reap the bitter fruits of our own inaction.

Yours in urgency,

Shaun Murray

It is very obvious to all scientists that climate change will make every year harder to adjust to a warming planet. We have to begin this year to make some fundamental changes. Why don't we embrace the reality and become active in every way possible to lead the world. Lets make Australia Carbon neutral in the next few decades. this can be done with some serious effort and a comprehensive education plan. The present target is utterly pointless. The cost of the impacts verses the cost of adjustment make this kind of target a silly and cruel joke. Let Australians know what the real situation is then lets hit it hard.

Stuart

It would be great to see the party that I voted for have the fortitude to look past winning the next election and do something that demonstrates leadership and vision.

If No Planet - no economy or employment will matter

Be forward thinking and provide seed funding for innovation which will create more jobs - Australia - The Smart and Ethical Country

Jack

I'm dismayed by the government's weak response to man-made climate change, and significant action needs to be taken to arrest further damage to the environment. I would like to see a commitment to 50% reduction of greenhouse pollution by 2020, even if this means taking significant economic and trade losses in the years to come. Australia can recover from this short-term financial loss, but if we continue the way we are (even with a 5% reduction) the losses will be significant in the long-term.

Regards,

Rene Pfitzner

To the Australian Government,

I am a supporter of Get Up's Campaign to demand that you, on behalf of we the people, take a leadership role with strong action in the face of climate change.

It is clear that the 5-15% target is insufficient and caving in to the demands of the heavy polluting industries.

I believe that our efforts in embracing alternative energy sources are neither far reaching nor imaginative enough. I believe that you have poorly gauged how much the greater public desires to be engaged in these processes and make their own contributions.

The fact the the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall thus negating the contributions of individuals and small business holders like myself is a slap in the face of the Australian Public and sends out a negative message to all households.

Get on board, make us proud, let's be global leaders on this.

Andrew Marks

The 5-15% target is woefully inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Please reconsider and instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. It is possible.(on 1990 levels).

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. See the splitting off of the ice bridge reported in the media just this week.

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. Prime Minister Rudd was a strong voice in the financial 20 meetings in London last week. So please lead the world on this even more important issue of climate issue.

I am not an expert on Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) but those who are claim that is is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good because the scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

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

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

Be brave!

Bev Fitzgerald.

Please realise that in the interests of our children we want real action on climate change. The world economic troubles are insignificant in comparison with the threats of climate change.

I will be judging you at the next election on your climate change action and NOT on your economic policy adventures.

Ironically, it is about the former that you can actually do something, whereas we all know that you and governments around the world have had and will continue to have very little ability to influence economic direction.

So, let's have less posturing and more meaningful action.

Leon Nielsen

Please take climate change seriously as we have nothing if we don't have a planet to live on.

Climate change is happening more quickly than was at first predicted and governments around the world have been slow to take up the challenge.

The 5-15% target to reduce polluting emissions is totally inadequate in view of the slow reaction time to make changes.

Yours sincerely,

M.Marsh

Dear Politicians

Australia's emissions targets are dangerously low. How can we be seen as contributing to combating combat climate change with a target of only 5-15%? How can we be even remotely considered to be leading in this field, as the government suggests. How can we believe in our government?

My previously unshakable confidence in this government has been seriously undermined by its weak and vacillating response on climate change policy on a global scale. The government is allowing the vested interest of mining and manufacturing lobbies to prevail not only over government ideology but over the survival of the planet.

Australia must increase its pollution targets to 50% by 2020 and we must prove to the world we are prepared to take drastic action, and enforce it, to reverse the devastating potential of climate change.

Yours sincerely

Dael Allison

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

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

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

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

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

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

We need to act while we have the ability to make a difference. 15% reduction by 2020.... the damage will be done and the changes we will have to make to our lifestyle to stop or halt detrimental climate change be much, much greater than reaching a target of 50% by 2020.

Regards,

Sarah

I am so concerned about the stance of our current government. I remember, you had promised a far greater commitment to reducing our greenhouse emissions before you came to power.

I do not believe focussing on the economic situation is going to help us long term. So come on get to work and change those targets so that we have some hope of still having a habitable world for our grandchildren.

Jean Sietzema-Dickson

:

Climate change is happening faster than we thought. 5-15% target is really inadequate. Please be serious. 50% reduction of greenhouse gas pollution is most obviously and urgently called for now.

We demand that you will make your best and most urgent efforts to achieve this.

M. Ardley

Dear Elected representatives of the Australian people,

I write to you in concern about the proposed weak reduction in emissions target of 5-15% proposed by the Government.

As a scientist I am constantly exposed to new literature which repeatedly predicts that both the rate of climate change is increasing, and similarly that the dangers to the planet's ecosystems are more drastic than previously realised. At the same time evidence suggests that time for action is fast running out, leaving the world with only a small window of opportunity for averting this crisis. Once drastic climate change starts, a cascade of ecological and climatic catastrophe will unfold, to which we will have no control.

As a result, I believe Australia and the world cannot settle for carbon pollution reduction targets weaker than a 50% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020.

As has been repeatedly stated, the cost of inaction will far outweigh the cost of strong action now.

Strong emission reduction targets must ensure that Australia's carbon pollution is drastically reduced across the board. Any scheme to reduce carbon pollution must not limit itself to the set targets. Further voluntary reductions should be possible, and meaningful in reducing Australia's overall emissions without simply passing on a ticket for increased emissions to another party.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is badly designed. Here are some additional points which I support:

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

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

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

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

As part of any plan I would also like to see the protection into the future of our natural carbon sinks, native forest. In addition to this I believe a large-scale program of bio-diverse reforestation is required across Australia. These two approaches will not only help mitigate carbon pollution, but also help buffer our ecosystems to any future climatic change, should the world fail in averting it.

I would like to conclude by pleading for real, strong reductions in carbon pollution, which start immediately. Our way of living and future of biodiversity on this planet is what we risk should we fail in averting dangerous climate change.

I really believe climate change is a desperate crisis that is just around the corner. We need to act strongly NOW!

Thank you for your time.

Tobias Smith

To Whom it may concern,

I believe that the Government's proposed 5-15% emissions target is, frankly, a joke. I believe that this country can do a lot more to combat climate change, and that Australia's greenhouse pollution level can be reduced by 50% by 2020 if change is undertaken immediately. Setting a strong target will ensure that Australia does its share in combating climate change.

I am particularly appalled that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will impose a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall. This ensures that the actions of individuals and small business will not reduce Australia's greenhouse emissions further than the 5-15% target, and will merely allow larger industry to increase their emissions.

I believe a focus on renewable energy sources will both aid us in reaching this goal and also serve the purpose of stimulating our economy in these troubled financial times.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Griffin

I feel the current government has really let me and Australia down when they have addressed climate change.

In there pre election promises they won my vote with there proposed climate change promises and now they have the opportunity to implement these changes they are only half heartedly doing so.

I feel all issues on climate change should be addressed promptly and thoroughly and currently this is not the case.

Please take my submission to whoever needs to see my concerns to improve this situation.

Regards,

Stephen Moore.

I write for the purpose to inspire my Government to be fairdinkim on climate correction.

It is obvious that the 5-15% target is a diversion of interest from the problem. It's not what the people want or the Government actually, but once again we see our leaders march to the beat of a few (with money and the power that that brings).

WE can and must commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

This Government was by and large, elected on their green credentials and their promise of change. Do it. Be brave and do it.

Yours sincerely,

Anne-Louise Farren

The Government's 5-15% target is completely unnaceptable. Rather than a commited and effective response to the challenges of Climate Change, their proposal is nothing more than a token gesture designed to give the appearance of real action.

Significantly more government time and money needs to be devoted to the wide range of sustainable electricity resources and systems available in Australia.

One practical proposal discussed by many of my friends, family and colleagues is that of Solar Panels. Solar Panels are such an obvious and readily available option that the government is practically ignoring. My family was looking to invest in a solar panel system for our home, yet the large cost associated with the initial installation and purchase was just too much.

The Government should devote billions more dollars to a comprehenseive and generous solar panel rebate scheme, going much further than any current or previous schemes.

If Solar panels were made to be an easy to acquire product and made less expensive by a government rebate scheme then the uptake of panels would soar. Solar panels on every roof! That should be the vision for the Government and they should put forward an effective system to achieve that vision.

Also, the current CPRS is completely flawed.

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.

Thankyou,

Tyler Brady

Dear Senators,

The target of reducing carbon emmissions of 50% by 2020 is absolutely neccessary when looking at the latest scientific data available on climate change. Indeed, according to some leading scientists (Monbiot et al), international carbon emission levels must drop by 95% by 2050 in order to in anyway prevent the catastrophic climate change that is evindenced in earlier ages of our planets history.

I, my young family and my community - who are a wide group of people who universally demand immediate, wide reaching and base level infrastrucutural-industry change for climate action, urge you to send this policy back to the Government with a strong message.

Furthermore, our environmental prosperity is tied to our economics and if the Federal Government is serious about 'future proofing' our nation, then they must get ahead of the game in undertaking the enormous changes that appropriate climate action requires.

A huge proportion of Australian people are sincerely afraid and bold, far reaching leadership must be shown at all levels, from homes to workplaces and to Canberra.

Yours Sincerely,

Sam Fox

Dear Mr. Rudd and Ms. Wong,

I am one of the millions of Australian voters who feel that the Government's target of 5-15% is not adequate to avoid catastrophic climate change. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt within the next 5 years, and we MUST take action now to avoid this and other irreversible disasters.

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

I believe that the current CPRS proposed by your Government is badly designed and will do more harm than good. The scheme clearly overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

PLEASE rethink your stance. We only have one chance to get this right.

Sincerely,

Flora Smith

Australia may be isolated geographically, but we can no longer afford to isolate ourselves from the urgent global threat of climate change.

We must join with the world leaders on this issue, and resolve to do everything possible to avert a disastrous environmental impact.

These measures must include an increase of the Government's inadequate and weak 5% emissions target. This can be largely achieved by investing in clean and renewable energy sources on our roads, in our homes, and at our workplaces.

This investment will create a vibrant clean energy industry for the nation, which will not only save the planet in the long term, but it will also provide much needed jobs to stabilise the economy in the shorter term.

Time is running out, and while policy shift is not easy or convenient for a Government, there is simply no other option. The Australian people are pleading for real leadership on this issue, as are the people of nations right around our world.

Sincerely,

Anthony Paes

The current proposed targets of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution is woefully inadequate and counter-productive to an Australian environmental initiative. I urge you (along with many other contientious Australians) to PLEASE increase this % to a further reduction of up to 50%.

The economic and social benefits for Australia are well-documented and very real. Economically this is harder to see in the short term, buin the long-term, the wise and socially responsible thing to do is reduce emissions further. Please stand to take your place on histories wall as a benevolent leader with foresight and conviction.

Thank you and regards, Paul Williams

Dear Mr Rudd and Ms Wong,

We really need to be transforming our country's economy from one that cow-tows to stupid neo-liberal ideas to one that engages seriously with the fact that we live in a world that is limited in both its natural resources, and in its capacity to continue absorbing the excessive CO2 we are generating with our affluent life-styles. We could live just as long, and as happily, on a tenth of the resources (including carbon) we currently consume. This is anathema to the "Buy! Consume! Waste!" mantra of the mainstream economists. We have to stop listening to them as well as the crooks running the coal industry. These people don't give a stuff what happens to the planet. I do, and I know you do, so I implore you to take some bold steps to move away from the economic status quo immediately, and implement some realistic carbon reduction goals, along with some serious investment in renewables. 5-15% is almost not worth bothering with.

Sincerely,

Simon Foale

Hello,

I believe it to be extremely important for Australia to act bravely and strongly with regard to setting the agendum for combatting climate change. Polluters should not be compensated and promoting the reduction of emission must be a priority.

Yours faithfully,

Sharon Medlow

Please reconsider the 5 to 15% reduction on greenhouse pollution. We need to take a global stand and provide leadership in this area and commit to a 50% reduction from 1990 levels.

As a government you have the ability to stand out in history by taking bigsteps to prevent global disaster.

The longer we leave action the less likely it is to be effective. If we start the change now the economy on the whole can start to adapt to the future needs of the planet.and encourage growth in 'green' industries.

Please make me proud to be Australian.

thankyou

Natalie Miller

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to let you know, that I want you to take real action to avoid dangerous climate change.

The 5-15% target to reduce greenhouse gas emission is not sufficient, if Australia wants to make a fair contribution to reduce dangerous levels of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. Australia should reduce greenhouse gas emission by at least 50% by 2020.I would also like you to know that the proposed carbon pollution scheme needs to be redesigned. I don't want the carbon emission reduction scheme be under a cap. I want the big industries to do their bit and reduce their emissions by 50% by 2020 is well.

In the name of future generations on planet earth

regards Bruno Hofstetter

Climate change is now a generally accepted reality that at worst threatens the survival of the planet and at best will entail serious consequences for society. It is imperative that serious action is taken to mitigate the effects of greenhouse gases on the climate. The world is capable of taking such action as the global collective action to mitigate CFC use demonstrated. However leadership is required.

Australia by itself can do little that will meaningfully impact the level of CO2 in the atmosphere. Its main opportunity in addressing this challenge is in convincing others to act. In order to do that it must take credible action itself first.

The Governments 5% - 15% target is not enough in this regard and the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is seriously flawed in the way that it compensates polluters and undervalues the contributions that communities and individuals have taken.

These flaws need to be addressed so that Australia can credibly take a leadership role in the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference and influence other countries in the region to take serious action.

Simon Payne

I am flabbergasted that, with all the credible scientific information available, our government has still only suggested we reduce emissions by a tenth of what is necessary.

Also, my big beef with the CPRS is that it is hard for household actions to count. I would like households to be able to hang on to the RECs generated by installing solar systems.

Please, please, please govern for the people, and for the world, and not just for political or individual gain.

Regards,

Manisa McLennan

to whom it might concern,

please increase substancially your greenhouse reduction target

Sincerely,

Santiago acera

The current federal governments 5 % carbon reduction policy is too little too late. We will remember this the next election.

Kevin Rudd don't be a dud act on behalf of ALL Australia and increase the minimum reduction to that recommended by the Garnaut report.

Kevin Rudd lease support ALL Australians not just those with the biggest voice that of industry support OUR future - not theirs.

Jonathan Baskett

Dear mr. Garrett and friends,

picture a 510 ml pint. picture it 504 ml full of alco pops. now picture an ice-cream sized ice block being dropped into it. you think it would rise by 6 ml? or more? it dosen't matter which one you chose, the results would not be good for whoever wa holding that glass of alco pops. and no, the alco pops is not taxable. but guess what?! what caused that ice block to drop into the pint glass is. its called carbon dioxide and its threatening the world. your 5% proposed target is a slap in the face to everyone who knows the truth. didn't you have a mandate to do something about climate change? do something about it and stop looking like a weak, insipid, spinless parasite.

with hope,

Daniel McManus

The Australian Government must revise its planned strategy for a response to the effects of climate change. It is now widely recognized that the climate is changing faster than predicted, and so the only reasonable course to chart is one that will more quickly bring us to the point where we are able to make meaningful changes to our carbon emissions.

In light of the acceleration of climate change it is obvious that a 5-15% target is insufficient to effect the situation, while that low target will encourage other countries to take a weak option ... if Australia can get away with it, we can too.

Particularly, I would like my own efforts to change my own behavior as regards climate change to have some direct effect on the situation. I do not want my own actions to be completely screened by sweetheart deals made with powerful lobbyists. As individual citizens we are all responsible ... every breath we take, every move we make ... and to be sidelined by the Government I voted for specifically to take action on climate change, is a shocking and demoralizing insult.

I urge you all to consider the dire predicament in which climate change puts us, and to reconsider the steps you will take as my Government to address the climate issues. Take strength from the fact that the overwhelming majority of voters are in favour of strong action being taken in this area. Lift your game and raise the target.

yours

Simon Veitch

There is no question that the balance of world's climate has now become disrupted and it it getting worse. It is happening right now. It is also clear that a major cause of this disruption is human activities, especially industrial and other forms of controllable pollution of the atmosphere, aggravated by relentless forest clearing and burning. The demands of the people are more important than the demands and denials of polluting, climate-destroying industries and backward, seat-warming Trade Union officials. We are all living during a time of economic crisis. This crisis could be much more serious than the Great Depression which caused mass unemployment and poverty during the 1930's. Coupled with climate disruption and a critical world-wide shortage of energy - think peak oil - mainly by the wasteful, damaging and over-use of fossil fuels, it becomes clear to even the most casual observer that we are all sliding into a massive economic and environmental abyss the like of whi

ch has never before been experienced by the human race - or life on Earth. We urgently need to take advantage of modern, technological advances to have more realist, stronger pollutiuon-control targets while introducing more renewable energy industries and concepts. We can no longer tolerate the naive, primitive and backward-looking luxury of political party or ideological differences. All of us are in this together. Let's work our way out of it together.There is no longer any other choice. The people of the world are demanding positive action. It is up to you to set the ball rolling...

Peter Cundall

A 5% reduction does nothing to address the very real possibility that our carbon emissions are contributing to environmental changes, global warming, melting ice, choking rivers, and dying species everywhere. For humanity's sake...lets get serious, acknowledge the fact that we are, as the dominant species on this planet, destroying it!! destroying the very foundation of our existence!! I put it in those selfish terms, as we do not seem really to care about the rest of the population of life ie: animals, plants etc. But do we care enough to save ourselves? Maybe we are so so ignorant, so shortsighted, so un-enlightened that we do not even see this self evident truth. Mankind, can he, will he, can he now, or will he ever CHANGE? A 5% reduction seems ludicrous, given the fact that the changes to the earth are literally happening all around us. Will we continue to sit on our hands, doing nothing, like frogs in slowly, but surely boiling water? Please, a minimum target of 20% must

be considered if we are even remotely serious about what is happening right now.

Mark Hayward

The CPRS is not a document that the world can look to and say this is what we need to do. It will be pilloried at Copenhagen as being the weak sop to the coal industry that it is. The whole thrust of any CPR scheme must surely be the reduction of reliance on fossil fuels and set out a strategy for the phasing out of coal within a generation and other fossil fuels some time after that. Other polluting industries such as aluminium production need to be protected in the interim, because eventually they can be powered by renewable energy sources of which there are many options. We can't pretend there is "clean coal" technology, because of the simple fact that pure carbon (coal) when burnt with oxygen produces pure carbon dioxide. 12 kg of coal produces 44 kg of CO2. This is an indivisible law of nature. Collecting and storing CO2 will be immensely costly and certainly less cost efficient than technologies which produce electricity from wind, ocean wave, geothermal or sun.

Please Penny Wong and fellow government ministers, engineer a CPRS that will do the job it is supposed to do. Stand strong when the coal industry put the frighteners on you. The Australian people are becoming better informed about the real issues and can see the through the bluff of the coal industry. If Xstrata says they will pull the plug on investments in NSW because of the costs of the CPRS and say it will cost jobs, then don't be fooled. It is a victory for your scheme, because isn't this what we should be doing. It is all bluff anyway. They will invest in these ventures because they can still make profits with the present CPRS. They can be encouraged to invest in renewable technologies.

Please produce a CPRS which we can demonstrate to the world that this is how to fight global warming - not the present toothless coal industry friendly script that citizens groups and environmentalists had no input into.

Dan Caffrey

Dear Senator/madam/sir

I vote for a stronger responce to the climate issue.

I want Australia to be part of the future - not a ball and chain, left clinging to the past.

I would like to see Australia reduce greenhouse pollution by 40% by 2020, based on 1990 levels.

Australia's weak target undermines efforts toward international agreement; it must be improved before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

I would like to see a full review and amendments to the compensation arrangements for those who are unable to meet reduction targets.

Please act strongly on this issue

Yours sincerely

Verity Morris

It is extraordinary that, with the planet facing its greatest crisis since human habitation, the Government, which promised so much, is now acting as if there is no real crisis. The pathetically inadequate CPRS target demonstrates that the Government cares more about the big polluters than the future of its citizens. Shame!

Terry O'Neill

To whom it may concern:

Dear Sirs,

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.

Please address these crucial issues in your review of the weak 5-15% reduction target proposed by the Government.

Yours sincerely

Ronald Brown

I am angry that world governments still do not appreciate the gravity of the problems we face. Frankly, even Green and other lobbyists go nowhere near far enough to approach solutions to our mutual planetary problems. This is not an Australian problem, it is a global one, and, as a world citizen I resent what others are doing to my habitat.

I have known for some decades that the way we have been living in the Western world has been completely unstainable. Please listen to people such as David Suzuki now that 'the wolf is at the door'. There can be no delay in implementing radical and equitable reforms which may slow down the damage being done to my (and your) planet and its ecosystems on which humans rely. Any economic quibbling now will revisit us many-fold in the future, and is already costing us all far more than if we listened properly in the 1960s and before. Human greed and shallow needs know no bounds when there is a short term 'free lunch' to be had.

Our most desperate need is to reduce energy usage and consumption of resources (for which we can blame the self driven commercial world and mass media) along with a reduction in world population. If we don't take control of this, it will happen anyway, the poorest will suffer first, and the rest will start wars over resources such as land, food and oil. Sorry - it's already started.

This is not a game, or one which we can afford to think that we have a second chance. We don't. The nature of global warming and attendant climate changes is that of exponential trends, and we are on the steep side of the curve. This is not a linear progression, as I like to teach year 4/5 students! Until we can learn to live with and for our planet, we are not in control, and should not fool ourselves any longer that we ever have been.

This stupidity must stop! Any actions taken now will now make little difference, but perhaps we could pride ourselves that at least we tried, and gave it our best. Please - 'get up and get real' and do something decent for us and others who share this planet!

In hope, Dan Burt

I voted for a party that said it stood for dramatic and immediate action to reduce Australia's carbon footprint and to stand up for the future as opposed to give way to the vested interest of the major polluting industries. Even blind Freddy can see that the way we live today is not sustainable because the way we live today is greedy. We need government, local, state and federal to set the example, to raise the bar, to help us to be better people and preserve our country and help to preserve the planet.

We use too much water and then build a polluting desalination plant to supply water that actually we urban popluations wouldn't need if we had rainwater tanks and a low tech approach to conserving water. We drive our cars when we could walk or cycle. We allow industry to pollute our waterways and we allow our councils to wash mountains of street litter into the ocean. We cut down native forests, arguably the most effective carbon capture facilities in existence, and propose incentives to put plantations in their place. I want the government to know that setting such a bad example as the ridiculously low targets for reduction of Australia's ecarbon emissions verges on the insane. Does this parliament want to go down in history as the one that turned a blind eye to the future and looked only to what they thought sounded ok to the people and absolutely delighted industry. Please don't rush into discredited schemes and inadequate targets. Our country has the highest rate of extin

ction of mammals IN THE WORLD. Why is that? I urge you to lead the way on the most important issue of our lifetimes, not whinge and tell the world that we're not going to set tough standards unless India and China do - that's ridiculous. Be leaders - that's what we voted for.

Victoria Treole

I would like to state that the current governments proposed 5-15% reduction in green house gasses will have an insignificant effect on climate change. The only way forward is for Australia and other countries to move quickly away from carbon polluting industries such as coal. Compensating companies that pollute will not give them enough encouragement to move forward to a low carbon economy. The tough decisions need to be made now and Australia as a wealthy economy needs to lead the way and show the rest of the world how we can dispense with high polluting industries and replace them with new green industries. If we do not act now the future of Australia and the world as we know it will be very bleak.

Regards,

Simon Junankar

Dear committee members,

Studies of climate change indicate that our planet is now at risk of undergoing runaway climate change in the decades ahead, meaning that the gradual increase in temperature such as we've experienced thus far will trigger events, such as the break up of ice shelves, which will accelerate the rate of climate change.

Since this is an undesirable outcome, not only for future generations but, for the younger of us, ourselves, we must the politicking aside and take serious action to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases entering the atmosphere.

While carbon trading is one possible scheme, I believe the options of limiting emissions at the source, taxing fuel as it is produced (e.g. coal), and taxing emissions outright -- these options must be examined too. Sadly, we must also now examine climate engineering to see if we can mitigate the problem.

Most importantly, the must break our addiction to the "growth economy". Firstly we must adopt a "shrinking economy", to bring our consumption down to a sustainable level. This means less material goods and services for all of us in this rich nation. Once we've reached a sustainable level, we can adopt a "sustainable economy", where growth hovers around 0% indefinitely.

Steps to achieving the shrinking economy include working fewer hours (I'd guess around 15-25 per week) and disincentives for industries that produce little of value, such as the finance industry.

I do hope you will consider seriously the points raised in this submission as this problem will not go away, and Australia must, in my opinion, take a lead rather than a back seat.

Yours faithfully,

Sean Vickery.

We're farmers, and seeing the fast and dramatic changes in our environment is on our doorstep. DO SOMETHING!! For God sake ALP - stop being sooooooooo weak at the knees! So far, it's all rhetoric... 'you're the goodies because you're not the Libs'. Well DO SOMETHING! What you've got proposed is FAR TOO WEAK.

Kath Freihaut

I feel that Australia's target of 5% is pitiful. They shoud be cut by 50% by 2020. The efforts individuals make should be encouraged rather than subsidising old poluters.

yours sincerely

Michael Fink

Australia has an incredible amount to lose due to the effects of climate change. Our economy and environment will be damaged beyond repair unless strong action is taken right now.

A 5-15% target sends the message to the world that we do not care much about climate change. And if we are not taking action, how do we pressure others to do so?

Further, we need strong incentives to drive a new, green economy. Our new economy must include alternative, sustainable energy sources and radical improvements to energy efficiency in everything we do.

The proposed CPRS does not significantly drive alternative energy sources or energy efficiency.

Political leaders who do nothing to drive a new green economy cannot hope to be elected by an increasingly concerned electorate.

Please design a system that actively drives alternative energy and energy efficiency.

Yours faithfully,

John Sedy

Ministers we need better, bigger action to address this problem. The target for reduction of 5% to 15% is woeful; there has just been a collapse of a huge ice sheet with more forecast, and we act as if we have heaps of time.

I voted for you because you promised, Mr Rudd, Ms Wong, Mr Garrett, to act. I strongly believe that in this as in so many other areas, you have let me down. You have broken your word.

We need reduction of greenhouse pollution by 50% of 1990 level by 2020.

We need to be strong for the UN copenhagen conference in December on Climate Change.

We need something much better than the ill-conceived CPRS, which would take MY good efforts and use them to reward pollutors, allow dirty industries to increase the pollution they produce.

We rich countries made the mess, we have ethical responsibility to work to fix it and be seen to be doing that. And our future, finacial and otherwise, depends on the environment being healthy, it can not work the other way. There must be opportunity for growth if we work with new indutry and new challenges.

Maria O'Neill

We want a much higher target than 5% for emissions reduction. Be more decisive. I am ashamed of Australia's weak response

Kate Stedman

Please for the sake of the future world and humanity's survival commit to taking drastic actions to counter act global warning. The time has come where it is already to late to prevent disaster! Only immediate action will help prevent more harm. Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. Remember that by doing so the current generation and government will be the ones remmebered as those that did so, rather than those that merely proposed. The resources and money are readily available for a wealthier country like Australia to take action! As a 17 year old I want to be able to live out my life without this current global crisis expanding into a disastrous phenominon.

Sincerely, Kelsie Clarke, NSW

I have just heard that there will be a Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy, I welcome this. I have some major concerns over the governments current Climate Policy. Specifically:

1. That my individual actions not only won't reduce Australia's ghg emissions, but they will make polluting cheaper for major emitters. PLEASE MAKE INDIVIDUAL ACITONS ADDITIONAL TO THE TARGETS.

2. The targets are inadequate. I would like to see a 80% reduction target by 2050, and stronger 2020 targets, as per the recommendations of The Joint Standing Committee on Treaties (JSCT) and the Garnaut Reports. This would also take consideration of the lastest scientific findings (that change is happening more quickly than the IPCC worst case scenarios) and in line with US proposals.

3. Reconsider compensation for the big polluters. They are being overcompensated. There needs to be a faster transition and more incentives away from these industries. Alternatives are currently available and with true costing of products and services there will be more incentive to support the growth of these alternate industries and R&D of further sustainable industries.

Please lets do the hard yards now, so we still have choices in the future.

Thank you,

Rachel Dunn

I wish to express my disapproval to the ALP's approach to minimum target levels to global worming and we as a nation need to tackle the global warming head on by hitting all industries to individuals whom are big polluters.

The Government needs to promote industries who are willing to invest time and money into research and development of new climate change friendly technologies.

Regards, Alan

The icebergs are melting! The forests are burning!

Get on with it and make a real difference to our climate by setting stronger targets than presently proposed.

One of the reasons I voted for the Rudd government was because they were supposed to represent a more proactive stance in protecting the planet. I want to see a real difference in the approach of the Howard Government.

Regards, Toni Fisher

To whom it may concern,

The current plans for Australia's Climate Change Policy are flawed. They will be utterly ineffectual if allowed to be set at between 5 and 15% and will ultimately allow the effects of climate change to desimate our fragile environment not to mention our Economy.

In this time of financial uncertanty we need to do all we can to project enviromentally sustaianable jobs and invest in training and inferstructure that will be able to not only help mitigate our current CO2 emmisions but also free us of dependance on enviromentally destructive resourses such as coal fired electricity and fossil fuels.

Not only will our tourism suffer but so will a large portion of the population as sea levels rise and drought and flood become more and more prevelant.

While Prime Minister Rudd is constantly trying to build Australia's position as in International politics, this plan will undermine these efforts and fail to lead our smaller, poorer neighbour countries, the ones who'll be most effected by climate change, to take stronger action.

Australia should be commiting to reduse our CO2 emissions be at least 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels) in conjunction with a broad based retraining program for those workers in effected industries to continue working in fields like Renewable energy and future sciences.

Sincerly

Alex Bourne

To Whom it may concern,

My biggest concern at this current place in time is Climate Change or Global Warming. I believe that our Earth is in grave permanent danger and that this whole situation is worse than we think!

I propose that renewable energy be a target, especially solar as we are one of the sunniest and hottest countries in the world. Wind and tidal energy is also ideal because of the environmental and geographical features of this great continent.

I also believe we have to push to not only reduce carbon emissions but also to remove some of the greenhouse gases from our atmosphere. I believe that setting a strong target with a well designed scheme will encourage Australians to pull their own weight and to do their fair share in avoiding the terrible and unknown extent of climate change.

I beg that you do all in your power to make a change and to save this beautiful earth from being damaged beyond repair.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Vild

As a taxpayer I am willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary so please lets commit Australia to 50% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Hocking

5% to 15% is nowhere near adequate to deal with the seriousness of the problem or show the rest of the world we are serious.

Paul Stephen

There is nothing more important within our world's society than the pollution of our planet.

The degradation of our environment is a damning testament to our lack of foresight and consideration toward future generations.

Just as the G 20 has seen fit to move quickly on the so called "financial crisis"where are the true leaders who can honestly say, they have worked as diligently on bringing our atmosphere and the world's natural resources back to acceptable levels.

As the old saying goes about being the wealthiest man in the cemetery.

What's the point??

Maybe bankers can justify such pathetic behavior, but your average parent or grandparent appears to be a great deal more sensible.

John Gallehawk

To whom it may concern,

I write regarding the Government's current emissions reduction target of 5% (to 15%), which falls well short of the required target of 50% of 1990 levels.

I am particularly alarmed by the apparently increased thawing and break-up of the Antarctic sheet. I am alarmed by the fact that the link between climate change and the predicted incidence of devastating bush fires has not been drawn by the Government.

I am also alarmed that the funds raised by the carbon emissions trading scheme will be churned back into compensation for polluting industries, rather than invested in new industries (this proposed latter investmentI understand to be small by comparison to the former).

I am alrmed by the fact that carbon emissions reduction is not being seen as an opportunity to improve efficiency of existing industries and for the establishment of new sustainable industries. The 5% targets demonstrate this lack of vision to me.

I am also alarmed that the Government, and those it is trying to appease with such small targets, does not see the ethical issue associated with selecting small targets ourselves, while expecting much larger targets from other nations.

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to an improved Australian Government position on CPRS and emission reduction targets.

Yours sincerely,

Penny Wurm

It is not every day we have an opportunity to do something which can make a difference on a local and global scale which will impact on the lives of so many. Commit yourself to supporting policies which will help protect and enhance the environment for future generations.

You know it is the right thing to do.

Thanks for taking the time to read.

Regards,

Gordom

I demand that all parties in Australian Government take much stronger action on climate change and push the current government to commit to greater changes now!.

Australia's lax 5% commitment is completely inadequate in the face of the rapid change the world is undergoing. Australia also appears to be suffering at the forefront of these changes, as can be seen by the ever increasing rate that the coral reef is damaged, the rapidly decreasing water resources in the Murray and the fact that the season of severe fire conditions are apparent all year round, which surely must have been a contributing to Victoria's horrendous fires this year.

Yet this government's commitment rewards the big polluters. The small targets will be achieved by citizens like me doing the best they can with solar panels and other renewable energies, leaving industry to continue situation normal.

Any politician who does not stand up for this necessary rapid change should bow their heads in shame. They ignore the people who voted them in, the evidence of change around them, the consequences of what we will lose and the huge benefits to be had in eco-investment not currently encouraged.

For a decade the Australian government attached itself to the Bush administrations embarrassing block of the Kyoto protocol. In the US an historical change in government has seen great change - yet Australia continues to hold back in what is fast becoming an antiquated destructive commitment to the norm.

This year there is a vitally important meeting of nations in Copenhagen. Will Australia be seen as a great example keeping up a tradition of standing up for what is right, or as an old fashion backwater to be worked against?

John King

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to show support for the inquiry into the Government's climate policy.

I believe more needs to be done. This is not an issue that should be over-looked. It is our environment, and NOTHING goes on if we destroy it. It should be of priority that Australia's efforts be improved.

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).

Thank you for listening.

Regards,

Fiona

To whom this may concern,

We all know that major issues reside with the way business is operating at present, meaning the sustainability of every house hold.

If you Mr Rudd do not want to take on the challenge of what is ahead, which we all know is gone to far to reverse then my suggestion is the following.

Invite a household member to be employed by the government to reduce there energy consumption, have a house hold member enroll in a government funded save our planet program. Every Home Counts.

Reducing wastage with in the home, enroll the h-member to reduce consumption of processed foods, highly toxic consumer products around the home, with this enrollment the h-member should control a home grown vege patch, a recycling and reuse program, make there own meals and if they have a family, attend to the family needs, like teaching the children to be responsible and many more ideas.

A program to employee a house hold member makes perfect sence and brings community and sustainability back to each home. Mr Rudd you can get on with your job by trying to manage all the energy that comes at you in one day.

Bring the heart back to home....

That is where the other 95% emmisions are.

I would be happy to discuss this in more detail.

:Joanne Rachel: Costello

Dear Cross-Bench Senators,

The climate change legislation proposed by the Rudd Government is far too weak. It will achieve nothing. This needs to be strengthened in line with the amendments proposed by the Greens. Please ensure that the Government's proposed legislation does NOT pass through the Senate without these amendments,

Yours sincerely,

Frank and Joan Rigby,

Dear Senators,

I am most disappointed with the Federal Government's Climate Change target of between 5 to 15% (conditional). This target is inadequate and will not avoid dangerous climate change. It does not set an example to other countries to set adequate targets. When I voted for Labour I did so in the believe that if elected that Party would adequately address the issue. What a disappointment!!!!

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed by the Government is badly designed, as it does not consider the efforts of the community and small business to reduce carbon emissions and allows polluting industries to reap the benefits of the community's efforts. This is totally unacceptable

I therefore welcome the Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy

Hans Fankhanel

What could be more important than taking strong action to reduce the harmful consequences of human inducted climate change? Every aspect of our way of life depends on the condition of our environment, including the availability of water.

Our targets need to be designed so they deliver real benefits and the carbon reduction schemes need to be well designed to avoid perverse outcomes or lack of real action.

regards

Grace Mitchell

I believe the Government's target for reducing green house polution is not good enough. We need to commit to a much higher target closer to 50% before it's too late.

We need to change the planned Carbon Reduction Scheme so that polluters are not compensated otherwise they will go on the way they always have done.

Australia needs to promote reduction of greenhouse pollution so that our chilren will enjoy a more promising future.

Thank you.

Marta Paling.

I am extremely diaappointed in the governments response to date on climate change. Current targets for 2020 are too low and we do not have interim short term target that will ensure we get there.

Australia may not be a big polluter in the overall scheme of things but on a per head basis it is. We need to lead the way so that we can have a credible voice on the international stage.

Let's stimulate innovation by setting realistic targets that will actually make a difference. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme doesn't make the grade. Let's change it while we still can.

Ultimately, the economy means nothing if we don't have a world that sustains our species. I want to be part of the generation that turns this around. I want to tell my grandchildren, our generation put in place the steps necessary to halt the negative effects of climate change.

We can do it - we just need to be brave, take a deep breath and jump in!

Regards,

Samantha Merrigan

I am very concerned about the future health of our planet. I believe that human activity is having a deleterious effect on air quality, water quality, wildlife populations, and climate.

I am willing to make changes and bear the costs, and want my government to recognise this and take effective action.

The 5-15% target is not at all adequate. 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.

Yours sincerely,

Ailsa Binns

Dear Minister ,

We as a family are all seriously concerned about the Governments poor response to climate change issues we face which truly seem to be pandering to the corporations rather than the needs of humanity.

The Earth has warmed to the degree that we are presently losing entire ice shelfs from Antartica and this can only get worse when the glaziers are left exposed eventually

This stuff needs immediate responses from the entire world otherwise we will be made homeless in a very hostile universe by our own stupidity and lack of determination.Please act to increase the targets as our children are otherwise made sacrificial lambs for the sake of the almighty dollar

Please address this dire error in judgement and increase our targets to a level that allows us to survive this threat to our planets balance.

Terry & Leigh

Bradley & Family

I am a 25 year old Melbourne Resident extremely concerned about the impact that Climate Change will have on our environment, biodiversity, agriculture and other Industries.

I have been following the Federal Government's response to Climate Change and am highly disappointed with the target of a 5 - 15% reduction in greenhouse emissions. The scientific literature that I have studied in my Masters course is all pointing to climate change occurring much faster than we previously thought it would, clearly meaning that some serious action is needed immediately by the world, Australians included.

As you know, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) is not well designed to make the massive greenhouse cuts that the world needs to prevent damaging climate change. I think one of the most disappointing aspects is that it takes away my power as an individual to act on climate change. I am committed to reducing my impact through increasing efficiencies in my house, buying greenpower and making certain lifestyle choices. It pains me to read that any action I take will only serve to make room for Industry to increase their emissions.

I know of so many people, small businesses and community groups that are committed to reducing their greenhouse emissions voluntarily. It would be such a massive loss to the fight against Climate Change if this ability of ours is taken away from us under the CPRS.

In closing I would urge Government to please take some serious action on Climate Change (a 50% reduction in greenhouse levels by 2020), and not to strip away individuals and small businesses ability to join in the Climate Change fight. I want the next generation of children to be able to enjoy what the world has to offer us today.

Kind regards,

Kerrie Murnane

I, and many others elected you to Government with a clear agenda - to respond to the needs of the Australian, and global community with regard to the environment. ie not to pander to the entreaties of big business, the mining lobby and so on

We had 10+ years of a government who largely treated us as people unable to accept reality, who had to be protected - we want you you acknowledge that we, the people can and will "bite the bullet", accept the hard times, readjust our lives, behave responsibly - many of us are doing just that in our personal lives - earn my vote by providing the leadersip you promised for me, and my grandchildren.

In anticipation of you acting with courage and conviction

Alison Mackay

Dear Senators

I am really appalled by the government's weak climate change targets - Australia is in danger of not playing its fair part in the global effort to reduce carbon emissions. I cannot believe that the government's CPRS is actually designed so that the actions Australians make to reduce emissions will only serve to benefit big polluters - this is absolutely reprehensible. I will fight as hard as I can for candidates at the next election who sstand for stronger action on climate change, which is after all by far the most importantissue of the next fifty years and beyond.

Yours sincerely,

David Carlin

Part of the reason why I voted for Labor was because I was under the impression they were going to make a real stand on climate change. 5% is not going to achieve any substantial change. Furthermore, this carbon trading scheme is too easy on the big polluters.

Matthew Elvin

WE need stronger targets for our carbon reduction scheme 10 or 15% would be better.

yours faithfully Francis Smit

To be considered in the senate enquiry

I am worried that the process being discussed will not actually address increasing emissions. The real outcome of the proposals should be considered at all times, not just the appearance of success.

There is no point having all these discussions, using everyone's time and money, to come up with a process that just looks as though it will make an improvement.

The actual carbon emissions must be shown as very likely to fall drastically as a result of any new legislation or policy. The current proposal does not appear to be able to do this (or if it does, this is not being communicated properly).

I would also like to see the policy helping our poorer neighbouring countries to reduce their emissions too. We are in a position to show leadership and assist them by sharing technologies and providing realistic affordable alternatives.

regards

S. Diez

Dear Senate Member,

Please take this senate inquiry seriously. Please avoid politicing and point scoring.

We need an informed debate about an ever increasingly serious problem. Please put forward more realistic targets than those already proposed by the Rudd Government.

Gordon Mac Nish

As a practising town planner, I am very concerned with the apparent muted response to climate change by the Australian Government.

We seem to be in a "phoney war" where the likely impacts of climate change are not fully realised, vested interests are lobbying heavily and confusing the public debate and the government is taking a tentative approach.

It is time that the government showed some leadership. Rather than dipping its toe in the water, the government needs to at the very least remove its upper cap on the 2020 greenhouse pollution reduction target.

We need an approach to mitigating emissions which does not serve as a lowest common denominator by rewarding big emitters with massive capital gifts. Provide a sensible transition for trade exposed, carbon intensive industries by all means but do not create featherbed incentives which delay or defer the decarbonisation of our economy.

It is important to remember that a CPRS is only part of the solution and will not deliver the full measure of mitigation we need. Invest in public transport and alternative transport modes - walking, cycling. Require energy efficient buildings as a national approach.

Invest in the future and the opportunities offered by the green economy. Don't throw good money after bad on the old brown economy.

Showing we're fair dinkum on this issue will benefit, not burden Australia in the long run. Yes, we are global small fry, but there are massive benefits if we play some catchup and become a global leader.

The ultimate costs of inaction or inadequate action are much greater than the costs of appropriate action.

Informed public opinion is very concerned about this and about the lives of their children.

Tony McMullen

Australia's targets are pathetic and an embarrassment, after all, per capita we are the worst polluters in the world.

How can we expect other countries to take climate change seriously when they see our weak response to the climatic dangers that are already happening in this country.

We, as the worst polluters should be leading by example.

The scheme put forward by the government is an insult to those of us who are doing our utmost to reduce our carbon emissions as it is going to reward the worst polluters. Some incentive that is to individual households!

A strong target must be set and the coal industry made to clean up their act at their own expense. Leadership NOW.

Remember; NO ENVIRONMENT - NO ECONOMY

Yours Sincerely,

Margaret Waddington

Dear Penny, Peter,l Kevin et all,

In the 2007 election campaign I had lots of reasons for not voting liberal - David Hicks, Asylum seekers and non core promises to name a few. I also had a positive reason to vote labour - your promise to do more to stop climate change.

Unfortunately, the weak target range proposed is not enough to keep my vote.

Please do not take the easy option here - increase the targeted reductions to 50% of 1990 emissions by 2020.

Australia has an opportunity to capture the initiative here and earn the kudos and royalties associated with helping to solve this most serious problem.

Regards,

Rebecca

I believe the Governments 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

Please save the country for my children by commiting to reduce Australias greenhouse pollution by 50% on 2020.

Thank you, Kara Gabbett

The government has disappointed with it's mediocrity regarding climate change. Surely a more worthwhile economic stimulus would have been to spend the billions on a solar power station for each state?

Peter Anderson.

The weak targets set out by the CPRS are an insult to everyone that voted for Kevin Rudd and Labor at the last election.

To make matters worse, the detail allows Australia to reach it's reduction targets by buying credits from Papua New Guinea and Indonesia, by slowing clearing of forests in these countries. This means that Australian reductions are not even made in Australia, putting no pressure on polluting Australian industries to clean up their act.

The best environmental and economic results will be achieved by making Australia a carbon-free economy as soon as possible, allowing forward thinking companies to invest in Australia knowing that they will not be held ransom to volatile carbon prices, as Australia will be powered primarily by renewable energy.

Coal must be phased out as soon as possible, including coal exports and renewable energy must become Australia's focus of research, rather than CCS, which is completely unproven and can not be delivered en masse within the required timeframe.

A goal of 300PPM of CO2 and equivalent gasses must be aimed for if we are to sustain life as we currently know it on Earth.

Please act in the interests of Australia, and the world and not the interests of the Australian coal lobby.

Thanks

Kris Keogh

I am 24. I am of the age where I am in the position to lobby, to vote, to pay taxes and to start a family. Many people of my generation are using their vote to make sure their children grow up in a healthy world. And many people of my generation have begun to doubt the future our government are creating for us, on behalf of us.

We voted for strong action on climate change and that has not been met. Dissatisfaction regarding the government's target of a 5 - 15% reduction on 1990 levels is becoming increasingly evident across all generations, and there should be enough in that for the Government to take a step back and reexamine their entire stance on climate change.

We need strong action not just for our sake but for the generations to come. What kind of world will our children inhabit? A decline in wilderness, lack of water, increase in temperature and loss of species goes hand in hand with the amount we consume, pollute and populate.

We need strong targets. Much, much more ambitious than what they are now. We need at least 50% by 2020. How do we do that? I myself know at least half a dozen graduates in renewable energies who are struggling to find jobs in an industry that should be THE industry of the future - renewable energy.

The Government has stripped the public, particularly the young people, of the ability to make a difference to the lives of their children or potential children. Therefore, they MUST acknowledge the efforts of the population by either giving people the power to act or acting on their behalf.

The targets outlined in the Government's Carbon Reduction Scheme are as good as nothing. They are weak, and the Government are increasingly being perceived as a bunch of gutless and unaspiring conservatives with little foresight. If that is the type we wanted to take the lead in Australia we would have given our votes to the Liberal Party.

The economy is not the most important thing in the world. The melting Arctic, the droughts and the displacement of populations need the same action and leadership that has been thrown at the economic crisis. They need it urgently. The Australian public are being stifled by the Government's climate policy and now International efforts are also being thwarted by the same lack of initiative by Australia.

By all means deal with the economy, but why not use it to kill two birds with one stone? Why not?

There are so many reasons to change while change is still possible.

Take real action.

Regards,

Aimee Burslem.

I was very disappointed when the above policy was released as the targets were way below what is required, and what most Australians expected, in order to fight agains climate change. The 5 - 15% target is far from adequate in terms of reducing greenhouse gases.

As has been shown, just this week, with the breaking away of the ice shelf in the Antartic, the effects of climate change are being felt more rapidly than expected, obviously leading to higher sea levels.

It is difficult to demand international agreement and committment from other countries when our target is so low.

The proposed CPRS will achieve little in terms of reduction of greenhouse gases as it over-compensates polluters to the detriment of the community and environment. Also, because the floor, below which emissions cannot fall, has been set so low any action taken by individuals and small businesses will do little to reducte Australia's total greenhouse emissions.

With the economy in a dire situation, the encouragement of growth industries in renewable energy would provide a boost not only to the economy but also to the environment.

Sincerely,

Gay Graham

It is clearly apparent that the current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is completely inadequate. The need for environmental reform is more evident now than it ever has been, and the people of Australia are well aware of this.

We have a responsibility, as a nation, to respect and uphold the collective right of future and even present generations to enjoy adequate environmental standards. It is simply unacceptable that the governments target is a mere 5-15%, and this is overtly clear to the general public and is on the whole, largely indisputable.

During the current Global Economic Crisis, nation states are being called upon to recognise that their responsibilities as a state stretch far beyond the boundaries of their country, and into the global community. Just as the current economic crisis must be managed through collaborative decision making and strategic intervention, the current environmental crisis must also be managed and addressed as a global responsibility.

It seems as though with all the confusion associated with the Global Economic Crisis, the the government is neglecting to consider the other Global crisis - The Global Environmental Crisis.

I again proclaim that the current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is irrefutably inadequate. Steps MUST be taken to ensure that this policy is evaluated and reformed, as the consequences of setting such an inferior target are grave.

Regards,

Ashleigh

We are all so concerned about the economy that wew don't seem to look at the big picture. Climate change needs the government to act now and in a big way. 5-15% is not enough.

I can do my little bit but....

The government has a responsability both to educate and to act.

Please do a lot more now

Reyes de Lara

IT IS TIME THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ENACTED ON CLIMATE CHANGES AND REDUCED THE GREENHOUSE POLLUTION RATE BY 50% BY 2020. YOU OFTEN HEAR PEOPLE IN OUR LOCAL COMMUNITY, FAMILIES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS COMMENTING ON HOW 'THE WEATHER' HAS CHANGED THEN PREVIOUS YEARS AND THIS IS BECOMING MORE AND MORE RAPID.....TIME TO START LISTENING AND ENACTING!!! OTHERWISE YOU MAY BE TOO LATE AND THEN WHAT???? I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY TIMES WE NEED TO STATE HOW IMPORTANT THIS IS BUT I WILL CONTINUE TO VOICE UNTIL YOU TAKE ACTION THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND SUSTAINABLE TO OUR ENVIRONMENT AND CHANGING TIMES! AND I KNOW I DON'T STAND ALONE!!

YOURS TRULY

SHEREE BOOTES

Dear Mr Rudd,

One of the main resons I voted for you was your stated stand on climate change. Now I am deeply disappointed at your Government's proposal to reduce emissions by only 5% . Please consider a stronger stand than that especially for the well being of future generations.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Ball for Brian and Winsome Ball

It saddens me that the focus on global economics, and the current failings, should determine our government's willingness to tackle the largest global problem that we face - climate change. The fear of change, the influence of lobby groups and the prioritising of global financial markets, seem to have combined to create this weak target that completely undermines the expectations that I had of this government, when I voted in 2007.

I hope that an informed discussion can support an increased target - and a confident leadership that can inform our population of the benefits of addressing climate change, that will support our community through this change, and will address the fears and misinformation currently circulating.

I implore the senate to improve this current proposal and not shy away from facing these very real challenges that Australia, and the world, face.

Thank you,

Amy Lees

I am deeply concerned about the low targets set for carbon reduction.

a maximum of 15% is just far to low and sets a poor example for other countries. By all means set the minimum at 5% but please leave the top open or set an ambitious target of 50% by 2020. Let Australia lead the world in setting an example for others to follow.

Doug Steley

We are extremely disappointed with the Rudd Government weak approach to climate change, whether it be setting carbon emission credits (we completely disagree with handing major polluters carbon credits which can be sold for a profit as they were in the UK), failing to have and enforce meaningful increases in stream flows in the MDB, or failing to encourage in a meaningful way the generation of electricity by alternative means such as solar power sold back to the grid without restriction and at a premium price.

We are a very rich country (that squanders its wealth in private real estate), yet continues to pollute the world with coal exports and coal fired generation - both of which make us rich.

We should be setting an example (and moving more in step with countries like the UK) to the rest of the world. Why should high population poor countries like India and China do much about their soaring carbon emissions when they look to Australia to see what we are doing ?

Why do we ignore climate change yet we turn ourselves inside-out to slow down a recession which will have no-where near the same long term impact.

We must start taking a long term view of where we spend our national finances. Slowing climate change is one of them.

John and Cheryl Clark

The science is in and we have a chance, not so much to show leadership, but, as Ross Garnaut said, to not be a drag on the rest of the world.

McKinsey and others all have explained we can make the deep cuts that are needed and not suffer much at all in terms of economic growth. let's get serious. the antarctic is calving off chunks as we speak, the forests are burning, the country is half flooded, and yes, climate change is a result of our economic activity - that was al gore's inconvenient truth really. but we can succeed and show the world we are not a bunch of wimps by embracing harder targets. The USA can do it, why not us?

5% below 2000 levels is 9% above 1990 levels - a national shame. I don;t care about the carbon intensity numbers, they are a hollow whitewash. Absolute reduction is what is needed.

Let's push to match the USA with 20% below 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Go on, do what we elected you to do. The CPRS is a brilliant piece of work but let down by soft targets.

Dave

I wish to add my voice to the thousands of Australians who believe the Rudd Government's 5 - 15% reduction target is patently inadequate to deal with the problem of climate change. The Govt should not underestimate the sacrifices that the electorate would be willing to make if we had some decent leadership on this issue. Moreover, the inadequate targets undermine our credibility in taking a lead on the issue of climate change internationally. We are a small country but we are also one of the largest greenhouse emitters per head of population in the world. This is a disgrace and can only be rectified by strong leadership from the top - including vastly increasing funding into alternative power initiatives and ceasing the cowtowing to the coal lobby that has influenced Govt policy for far too long. Mark Smith

The Government of Australia

Its time people stopped thinking about their pockets and started to think about the future of our planet and what we are going to leave our grand children.

Do the right thing.

David Kirkwood.

I feel that we should most definately be committing to 50% reduction of all pollution by 2020.

Too many politicians and big businesses are only interested in the dollar.

If we don't act on climate change quickly there wont be world left to make a dollar in.

This country needs to be the leader in such action.

Derek Stubbs

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

The imminent collapse of the Wilkinson ice shelf in Antarctica makes this issue all the more important. We need to do something and we need to do it now.

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

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

Please act in the interests of future generations, not just the current one. I'm 27, I want my kids to be able to lead a healthy life and know the environment as it should be.

Rosie Offord

To whom it may concern,

The CPRS as it is currently proposed is dangerously inadequate. We are facing two global crises, both of which need to be considered in this legislation. A strong target (50%) with a well-designed, supporting scheme is the logical choice.

I support moving away from coal energy (and nuclear energy) to stimulating the economy and creating jobs by taking advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. A strong target with the support of goverment legislation will encourage this.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Barlow

We should follow the USA's strong lead and set much more ambitious targets to reduce carbon emissions. We should also ensure that all old-growth forests are protected as these trees store large amounts of carbon. Mr Rudd, we won't get second chances if we get this wrong.

Michael Howes

Thank you for this opportunity to raise my concerns for the Government's climate policy.

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

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

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.

I urge you to make the tough decisions that will bring Australia to the forefront of climate policy. We cannot afford complacency on this issue.

Kind Regards,

Jess

This country needs to stop wasting resources. Tremendous reductions in power and water usage would be possible if people and businesses let go of the old ways and accept that things have to be different from here on in.

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).

This is an acheivable goal if everybody makes sacrifices. People need to stop thinking they are entitled to everything, and particularly need to stop thinking that life should be entirely free of hardships. The days of every household owning a 60 inch plasma TV, and every CBD office building leaving its lights on at night, must go!

Michael.

I have studied this issue for 20 years. I built the web site to give information on Climate Change at www.planetextinction.com.au, formed the Crisis Colition in 2006 and have issues a fortnightly newsletter "Footprints" on current issues.

It is from this background and knowledge-base that I ask you to seriously consider this message.

I do not have to labour the issues nor the scientific evidence. I will restrict myself to the immediate issues all of which present a present danger to our country and democratic governance.

1. Food decline of enormous proportions plus even minimal sea-level rise will displace so many people that swathes of migrants will attempt to come here. So far we have no policy on this.

2. Hunger and movement of populations will destabilize many populations and therefore the governments that rule them. This will add the our instability and will make demands on both our humanity and our military stance.

3. Sea-level rise will (on minimal government estimates) threaten the home of a million Australians and will (well in advance of the actual rise) have an extremely depressing impact on property values.

4. This raises the issue of mortgages (how will they be repaid, for example) and a serious depletion in national wealth.

5. I do not need to go on. The risks are abundant and becoming more so with every atom of C02-e that is emitted.

THEREFORE, we do not have time to vacillate. This government must have the guts to act with determination.

I RECOMMEND: A carbon card (as discussed for the UK) in which everyone is given free a certain number of credits and must buy more if they exceed that. It is a beautiful scheme because it makes us all take personal responsibility. It has no impact on exports, only on local use. Lots has been written on this, so I wont go into details, but in all my studies this is the only scheme that does not penalize coal or other industries except to the extent that they are dirty. They will have to clean up their acts and so will we as individuals.

Dr John James OAM

I am disappointed that more action on climate change has not been undertaken.

Predictions of significant increases in the height of sea levels and increased temperatures are now being tabled as conservative. The lack of action in the face of this is alarming, and the legacy and cost that shall be left for future generations is concerning.

A solution is needed on a global scale. As a developed nation and one of the worst polluters per capita I believe that Australia should be leading the solution by committing to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme places the onus on the community and the environment whilst the industrial polluters are not held to the same standards. A consequence of setting a weak target is that reductions made by small businesses and individuals will be offset by allowing large industry to increase their emissions whilst the limited cap is still being met.

Setting strong targets will also encourage innovation in industry and could, if managed properly, allow for more economic growth for the Australian economy by fostering renewable energy industries.

Please take action and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

Yours sincereley,

Robert Metzke

Current efforts by the government to address carbon induced climate change seem to be all hot air and no action. The CPRS will do little to help the country embark on a program of fundamental change which is needed to protect our children (my children) and their children from the detrimental effects of human activity on this planet. The legislation needs to be stronger, make deeper cuts, be more innovative and to provide reason for individuals to change so that their efforts do not become a virtual subsidy for major polluters.

Regards

Keith Whitehouse

Climate change is only a part of the world's bigger problem of living unsustainably. We need to develop systems that ensure that the rate of extraction of the earth's finite resources does not exceed its capacity to absorb and reprocess the wastes.

Addressing this bigger and ultimately more important issue will also effect the appropriate response to dealing with climate change.

I believe this is the real issue that is not being talked about and is the cause of many of our problems. We don't need to argue about whether climate change is happening or not and what is causing it, the simple truth is that we cannot continue to exploit the earth's natural systems without suffering the inevitable consequences that will arise from the imbalance in nature that it causes (such as climate change).

Please act now to focus on the real issue.

Mark Harwood

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

Much is required by those to whom much is given, for their responsibility is greater.

Trusting in you, Kathy McDonald

Dear Federal Parliament

While I understand the fraught politics of putting pressure on the economy in a time of sharp decline, it is simply bad economic policy to restrict policy in relation to global warming as a response to the possible short term impact of strong global warming reduction policies on economic activity.

The Australian government's reduction target of 5-15% is useless.

For governments and parliaments global warming is not an issue that will fit with the electoral cycle. It is an issue that will give decision makers nightmares in their old age if they have not done all they could for the generations that will follow them.

On behalf of my children and my children's children and beyond, please do more to limit global warming.

Stephen Wright

Australia needs a much stronger emissions target, like many responsible countries of the world. Climate change is happening at a much faster rate than anticipated and if we do not take stronger action, what sort of future will we create for our children and grandchildren? The Rudd Government is not fulfilling it's election promises and I will change my vote if stronger action is not taken.

Margaret Clough

Dear Australian government,

As a Labour voter I am very disappointed to see that you are not aiming nearly high enough on climate change actions. We know that things are worse than expected yet you plan to legislate for less. It's no good waiting for someone else to take the lead. Please make my country a leader in the field.

Yours sincerely,

Geraldine Handasyde

May I urge you to read Tim Flannery's book 'The Weather Makers'.

Flannery is no doubt well-known to you; he is rapidly becoming well-known throughout the world; and his summary of the current scientific view of climate change is excellent.

We need the most urgent action. The planet really is at stake. This isn't some Hollywood horror film. This is for real.

Faithfully,

Richard Middleton

To - Mr Rudd, Ms Wong, et al.

Please ask the coal lobbyists to leave the building at this point, so you people can finally get serious about Climate Change.

The science is pretty clear, even to a non-scientist, and 5 - 15% is clearly well less than what's required to overt disaster. And the disaster will be an economic disaster too, let's not forget - even more of an economic disaster than the one that I'm sure all industry lobbyists are telling you we'll get if we aim for 40% instead of your paltry 5%.

Coal is history. It has to be, or we're all history instead. So it really is time to stop sprouting lies about "clean" coal technology (which is obviously a smoke screen), and get serious about alternative energy sources.

The only way for Australia to keep our economic head above water during the massive period of change that the world is entering, is for us to become world leaders in the new energy technology that every country on earth is going to need.

So let's start funding some serious R&D. Let's get some big mandatory renewable energy targets in place, and lets start spending our tax money on the future of energy, instead of it's past. Lets start fulling developing technology like Solar Thermal here, instead of shipping it off to California and Germany for other nations to profit from our lack of vision, and our lack of back-bone when dealing with the fossil fuel lobby.

Remember Mr Rudd - the people who voted for you didn't vote for 5%. We thought we were voting for someone who was going to get serious on Climate Change, and we won't take lightly to being mislead. We had enough of that under Howard.

Yours,

Jeremy Grogan

I am concerned for my grandchidren and all children of the world as climate change wreaks havoc.It's a finite world being overused and abused.

Australia should do more to limit greenhouse pollutants. The current target is inadequate. We should set a high benchmark to encourage other nations to do likewise at the Copenhagen UN Conference.

The model is such that it undermines citizens' efforts to minimise their polluting behaviours - because industries will thereby increase their emissions.

Have courage. Do more and be more effective.Shape a new environmentally sustainable economic order!

Anne Callaghan

I am disappointed that the Rudd Government has opted for such a low target, after such a promising start at the beginning of your administration. We should be committing ourselves to a 2020 target of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% of 1990 levels. I believe that there is definitely the will among most people to achieve this, but that you have allowed yourselves to be stampeded by the big polluters lobby.

I urge both Government and Opposition to please reconsider for all our sakes.

Bobbie Oliver

There is no doubt that the climate change is occurring much more rapidly than the scientists predicted.

Australia ,with the majority of its population along the seabord will suffer tremendous damage if the projectes sea risers occur.We have no time to lose ... action must be taken now .It is not an question of economics...it is a question of survival for much of life as we know it know.

Vic Brill

Australian consumers want to do their bit to reduce the impact of climate change, but to make a real difference we need a system that does not reward big polluters with the carbon credits consumers are creating. We need government policy to force power generators and other big polluters to change and not just soak up the credits consumers are creating.

This is too important to be delayed, and it is irreleavant if it happens during a recession. Jobs that might be affected in some industries will be redeployed into new technologies and other industries. Historically restructuring and change are features of any recession and implementing change now might be easier: the right time is now.

yours faithfully

Peter Vernon

The Science is In! Has been for years. The evidence can no longer be ignored... neither should it be. More, much more, must be done to ensure our Nation's contribution to solving the problem of emissions is not the weak one outlined in policy. Big business must be over- ridden with/ by logical but unequivocal powers to make certain that it/ they understand that the time for "open slather" is over. Government... of whatever stripe... should, must,encourage to the maximum all forms of alternative energy- creating enterprises, protecting them from belittling and interference by vested interests in the usual, major, fields. Times are becoming desperate dear Senators... not a lot of time left for the World we know.

Strength of purpose is what is needed now. Strength to grasp the hard decisions and make them reality.

For all our sakes.

Sincerely,

Bill Sanday

This weekend the bridge to the Wilkins Ice Shelf collapsed. The melting of Arctic Sea ice is likely to be happening 80 years sooner than predicted in 2007. Australia will suffer the kind of floods we used to see every hundred years, every year. (Greenpeace Report 'Final Warning' 24 March 2009)

The impacts we are facing are not a fringe environmental issue. They strike to the heart of our economy and our well-being. Loss of farming land, loss of coastal land, less water and more frequent fires are now part of our future.

Global warming science is not negotiable and the developed world needs to cut as much of 50% of our emissions by 2020. This is not an altruistic act to protect other people of the world. This is our own backyard. While it is true Australia represents only a small part of total global emissions, we are also a small nation.

We could act quickly on climate change, update our economy so it doesn't depend totally on fossil fuels, giving a massive boost to renewable energy and we could lead the world in clean technology exports. If President Barack Obama with a population of more than 250 million can lead with a bold vision of protecting the climate, why can't we?

I call on the Australian Government to review the CPRS,introduce a much more ambitious target of 40-50% cuts, and to enter the Copenhagen talks in December as a country in favour of averting climate catastrophe.

The current design of the CPRS scheme is worse than mediocre, it actually doesn't let emissions go lower than 15%. We are the ones to suffer some of the worst climate change impacts, so we need to show the world that we are prepared to do a lot more than this.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Short. (by email)

To all concerned,

Putting all prior criticism of the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme aside, I just don't see the point in only reducing greenhouse pollution by 5 to 15%. It seems as though it's merely a petty attempt to try to keep the environmentalists happy, which it's obviously failing at. I feel that if that something's worth doing, it's worth doing right. And my personal opinion is that this IS something that is worth doing right.

Sincerely,

Declan Roche.

I believe that the Australian Government is acting too slowly and planning inadequately in its efforts to reduce greenhouse pollution. Any target well less than 50% reduction by 2020 seems to be short-sighted. Acting weakly seems to me not only to be continuing along a path in which nature is neither valued nor conserved, but also puts at risk our life-style and economy, the very things that seem to be used as a rationale for not acting strongly. I think it is imperative that the Government shows world leadership and creativity in managing the current crisis.

Paul Casey

I work in the mining industry and I believe that it is possible to have an emissions target of 25 to 50%. It is possible for every household and business to reduce emissions by 5% just by changing light globes, so extra emissions reductions are easily achievable.

I visited Antarctica this year and there is evidence of climate change occurring there. Glaciers are retreating at a faster rate than was predicted. In the Arctic the news is even more dire with less than 10 years until summer sea ice is but a memory to pass on to future generations.

There MUST be STRONG, TOUGH action so that Australia takes a leading role in controlling emissions as our way of life will be affected more direly than many other countries. It seems as if the government's plan is rewarding large polluters and punishing individuals and families.

By insisting on a large emissions cut (50% by 2020) the government will be forcing investment in innovative technology to allow power generation from all sources to continue in the future. it will also increase the investment in currently available and relatively cheap 'green' power options.

I find it disgusting that Australia does not have major power generation from solar when in Germany there are towns that run solely on solar power. The government seems to forget that solar power can be stored in batteries for use when the sun is not shining. There are people in Australia who are not connected to the normal power grid and receive all their power from solar panels and batteries.

I am sure that if every building in Australia was given a 500 watt solar panel system with storage batteries and excess power able to be sold on the normal power network the greenhouse emissions would be reduced SIGNIFICANTLY.

If we (Australia) set a strong target within a well designed carbon pollution reduction scheme, we will show the world that we are serious about tackling climate change.

Bronwyn Turner

5% reduction of emissions is not enough! It is also an admission of expected failure, of poor assimilation of facts in the face of all the scientific advice that the government has access to, and of lack of leadership.

No wonder Australians are ashamed of their own country.

This lack of action, in the face of melting polar ice caps, unprecedented ferocity of storms, rising seas threatening island nations, and shifting climatic changes causing out-of-season floods, is shameful.

It is also potentially disastrous for Australia and for other countries. Australia is trying to lead everyone down the wrong path, the coal path, with demands that Australia be exempted from rules that other countries wish to enforce, that Australia is exceptional because of our politically chosen path of population growth, that Australia somehow deserves exemptions when Australia is one of the worst carbon emitters on the planet.

This demonstrates lack of leadership, lack of intelligence and total lack of ability in assimilating scientific data.

What happened to the election promise for 60%?

The current scheme will cost the public and the community, who will have to pay to support the companies that emit the carbon. This is not only foolhardy, setting us up for guaranteed failure of the objective of reducing emissions overall, it makes us appear a country of fools.

I am ashamed to call myself Australian today.

jo.mcrae

I urge the Government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. The 5-15% target is inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Surely the current drought/flood problems, and the crack in the ice shelf reported today, are enough to ensure that Australia takes a very strong stance before it's too late.

Jill Thio

I am distressed at and utterly appalled by the Government's inadequate Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. We have to do our bit to save the planet. Australia could be proud of its efforts to protect the planet and leave a habitable space for generations to come. As it is, we can feel nothing but guilt and shame.

I am angry that my efforts to reduce energy use will make no difference if you allow big business to use the energy I save because I want my children and grandchildren to live in a healthy world.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Judith Seaboyer

To the Senate Inquiry on Climate Change Initiatives

The matter of climate change is SO serious that any nation that has the capacity to take substantial action, MUST do so.

The issue is life as we know it on this planet. There are known climatic and ocean current thresholds that, if crossed, will lead to catastrophic outcomes for humanity.

Australia is a wealthy country. Our capacity to take BIG strides to reduce greenhouse gases is very great.

The time for this action is NOW.

We need a short-term time-frame to get off coal-fired power stations and switch to the renewables. Nuclear should not even be considered for Australia.

We need to see the present grant system for home solar power continued and not replace with a REC system that will lead to polluting industries being able to remain operating.

We need a NATIONAL gross feed-in tariff for all renewable energy producers.

We need electric cars on the road (using power generated by renewables) urgently (look at the obstacles placed in the path of the Reva).

We need urgent action on rail infrastructure and cycleways.

Most importantly, we need bi-partisan acknowledgment of just how serious things are and, basicly, a "call to arm" of the Australian people to get together, make a difference AND to demonstrate to the rest of the world that WE DO see the folly of insufficient action.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Bourne

t's time for the government to take a leadership role in climate change, not a reactive, soft stance.

Yes, some industry will be effected, however, surely this is an opportunity to re-invest in clean energy which will provide thousands of new jobs well into the future. The time to act is now!

C'Mon Mr Garrett, it's time to practice what you have preached and lead up to believe that you stand for.

Kind regards,

Chris Sandgren

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern with the pitiful 5-15% target for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. For a start this is not what the Rudd Government led the public to believe at the elections let alone I find it an offence to my intellect that you could try & pass this off as anything bar ridiculous!

I have just lived through the major bushfires in Victoria & if THAT isnt a reason to stand up & reduce our emissions & plant more trees I dont know what is?

Please reconsider this target as we need to commit to 50% reduction by 2020 - as anything less is a cop out.

I know we need business in this country to stay afloat but to sacrifice the environment is just foolishness.

As we have seen from the bushfires - nature cannot be bought & sold. She will wipe us from the face of the planet in one fell swoop & no big business deal will stop that.

I implore you to re-consider.

Regards

Tina Summers