

We have a responsibility to ensure that this planet is inhabitable for us and for future generations. We want the earth's climate to be restored to a healthy climate.

I for one support reducing carbon emissions by 50% by 2020. I am also happy to pay extra for technologies that are proven to be less polluting.

I want my government to listen to what I have to say about this sort of thing. We spent the last 8 years with a government that would not listen. Please don't follow suit and destroy my confidence in this government.

Reducing carbon emissions is going to be expensive, but at least it won't cost us our environment and wonderful countryside.

I employ you - please tighten the reins and really push toward renewable, environmentally friendly energy and lowering our carbon emissions by 50% or more.

I voted for this government believing that it would bring about change. Please don't let us down.

We want this.

Rodney Lane.

I voted Labour in because it seemed during your campaign that you would take a bold stance regarding climate change policy. I have been hoodwinked. Even the maximum 15% target proposed is inadequate.

We only have one world. We have underestimated the rate of climate change - governments must ACT NOW and ACT EFFECTIVELY. I am appalled that economics keeps being put above living organisms (not only humans either).

Renewable energy industries need a real boost - more power can be generated at point sources but there are inadequate incentives. Why prop up our highly polluting coal industry?

I will be ashamed to be an Australian if this is all we can come up with at the UN Conference in Copenhagen.

Yours in hope

Sue Slaytor

Setting a target of between 5 to 15% is demonstrating the power of vested interests over wisdom to lead the energy revolution and position Australia for a prosperous, clean and safe future. We should examine Germany's lead by supplying policies such as feed-in tariffs to shift investment into renewable technologies. Our government is not asleep on this matter, worse still, they are betraying the security of our citizens by pandering to vested interests. They are perpetrating a treasonable act by the true definition, as they hold the real information behind their decisions to support these out-dated energy producing systems whilst knowing full well, that to do so damages our country's future prosperity, security and shirks its global responsibilities.

Please take the treason argument to the public and demand justice. Our targets must be bold and our government must find the courage to sweep away vested interests in favor of representing the best interests of the majority.

Yours sincerely,

Magnus Mansie

I would like to suggest that the government aim at a higher reduction target.

As part of this, may I urge some form of pressure on our neighbours, particularly Indonesia and Malaysia, to preserve their forests. Quite apart from the tragic biodiversity loss, destruction of forest pours greenhouse gases into the atmosphere -- Indonesia alone, I understand, is responsible for something like 20-30% of greenhouse gases, just because of deforestation.

Most of the forest destruction is in the interests of spreading oil palm plantations. Palm oil is imported into Australia in many products -- cooking oil, margarine, soap and shampoo, biofuel -- but is rarely labelled beyond "vegetable oil". You could move towards restricting palm oil imports, and insisting on full labelling of any remaining products that contain it, so that people who are anxious to "do their bit" for the environment can avoid buying them (which they cannot do at the moment). Probably nothing, but nothing, will do more towards greenhouse gas reduction than these two actions.

Yours

Prof Colin Groves

I fear for our children and our grandchildren. Climate change is now inevitable and happening much faster than predicted even a year ago.

It continually astounds me that our leaders today are either unaware of the science surrounding climate change or are so seduced by the carbon industries they cannot imagine another way. We must change.

Even though there is no blueprint for a renewable future, for a sustainable life, we must trust that we can find one. Government must reward initiatives in clean energy and cease and prevent all polluting emissions.

I believe in the strongest reductions, in the highest payments to renewables and the toughest caps on greenhouse gases. Please make it happen.

We must reduce our footprint and extend our hand in friendship to those who will be made climate refugees as sea levels rise and disastrous floods and droughts get worse.

Make a safe climate for all!

Yours sincerely,

Victoria Osborne

Climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. This is such an important issue! I demand that the federal government commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse emissions by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). If we as a nation don't set strong targets, we are undermining efforts towards an international agreement in December in Copenhagen. This country must show more leadership! It is nonsensical that our proposed CPRS compensates polluters, when the exact opposite is required.

Please take strong action now, before it's too late.

Lyndal.

Tim Flannery sounded very worried yesterday on the radio when asked about Australia's response to the big ice cap breaking off in Antarctica. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's UN conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

As we know a steady stream of scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than was previously thought and the Antarctic summer ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

listen to Tim Flannery and people like him and take note.

Connie McNamee

I am disappointed with the weak targets set in response to the pressing issue of climate change. It is vital that we act now - and decisively - to combat climate change. It may be expensive and unpopular - but the alternative is far worse - irreparable damage to the planet that our children will inherit. Please - raise the target to a 50% reduction on 1990 levels in greenhouse gases by 2020.

Yours sincerely

Tony Christian



Beware! This is a lay-person's submission - but that doesn't mean it shouldn't be noticed!

The Rudd government was elected partly on its promises of strong climate action and yet strong is not what we have seen. We need to refocus our economy towards clean renewable energies and now is the time to do it, before it is too late.

New scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. The frequency of extreme weather conditions does appear to be increasing - the floods up north and the fires down south follow predicted patterns that Australia will become increasingly wet and tropical to the north and increasingly desertified in the south. I believe it will not be long until we will experience climate change refugees from within our own country - let alone from others.

This is not an issue that can be paid lip service to. We need strong leadership now. Mick Kelty has said that the greatest threat he perceives to our national security is climate change and the social ramifications it will entail.

I am concerned for my son's future and he is concerned too (he's only 9). Give us the leadership we need.

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

I am also saddened to learn that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. I was just getting inspired to make a commitment to a carbon-reduction diet in my personal life - and now I learn that it would be pointless.

Thankyou for listening,

Sally Newham, NSW

I am really concerned that the Federal Government's proposed 2020 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 5 to 15 per cent is too weak, and will not combat dangerous climate change.

There is widespread agreement among climate scientists that much deeper cuts are needed and I support Australia taking leadership and making significant cuts of around 50 per cent based on 1990 levels by 2020.

The threats are serious - floods, fires, heat-related deaths, loss of food and water supplies, loss of biodiversity. As someone who is likely to be around to face these threats I am very worried for myself and also for future generations.

By contrast, deep cuts can be achieved through energy efficiency; expanded renewable energy like solar, wind, geothermal and green transformers; expanded public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure; and better waste management. These measures are good for the environment and good for the economy as the world tries to transfer to a green low carbon economy.

While I support a good emissions trading scheme, I do not support the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, which together with weak targets, seems like little more than a green wash.

The scheme should not compensate heavy polluting industries that should either be phased out over the long-term or need to clean up and change their operations. I do not support free permits and compensation.

Particularly concerning is that the scheme will impose a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, which means the actions I take to reduce my emissions such as walking to work, not using air-conditioning, possibly installing solar panels when I buy a house, will only make it easier and cheaper for heavy polluters to offset my cuts with their pollution. I absolutely resent and oppose this part of the scheme - voluntary actions must be protected.

Regards

Tammie Nardone

I congratulate this government on taking action on climate change. It has been over a decade since we have had a government with the resolve to pay attention to the issues that not only affect our livelihoods now but have a potential to dramatically alter the planet we leave to the next generation.

I am however concerned about the level of commitment that this government has given to this issue. To me, the importance of a prosperous future for all should be the objective of decision making at the highest level of power, where the future is decided. Instead, this government has bowed to the pressure of vested interests and aimed very low on climate targets. This is not leadership.

This government has recently taken drastic action on short term issues such as the global financial crisis (GFC). They have shown leadership at the international level to support growth in our economy. Unfortunately this is not what is needed in these times. No growth or negative growth is the only way we will realistically get a reduction on our demands on the limits to this planet's resources.

I am concerned that government is not paying attention to the world's scientists. The IPCC recently suggested that carbon emissions are mounting up in the atmosphere at the highest of scenarios from their 2007 report. This tells me that we are in trouble. I often wonder if startling confirmations like this fall on deaf ears in Canberra. You must act now.

The CPRS is badly designed and with free permits going to the major polluters it serves as a potential to make the situation worse. Where is the concern for community and future generations in the CPRS? The 5% target must be improved before December or Australia will lose its critical leadership role at the UN conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

This government was chosen to represent the Australian people on this issue as a key election promise. This government must act now if it wants to be in the role for the duration of time that we can make a difference. If this 5% target is all it can muster, then the next election promise will need to make up for lost time, and we will have lost faith in the ability of Labor to follow through on election commitments.

This government was chosen to represent the Australian people on this issue as a key election promise. This government must act now if it wants to be in the role for the duration of time that we can make a difference. If this 5% target is all it can muster, then the next election promise will need to make up for lost time. The Australian people will lose faith in the ability of Labor to follow through on election commitments and be forced to look for real leadership.

regards

Phil Edwards

Dear K Rudd

I am saddened by the fact that you have decided to deliver so much in relation to emission reduction targets. There was so much positive speak when you came into power, and now it appears that you are able to hide behind the global financial crisis. The two are related. Last night the talk from the G20 summit was no more corporate greed. I believe that we are sponsoring corporate greed at the expense of our environment by not committing to stronger targets. Without a leader, how the rest of the world follow. Even our US counterpart is targeting more progressive levels than Australia. Come on Federal Government. Think about our children's children.

Regards

Chontelle Perucich

Dear Senators,

a 5% emissions cut is manifestly inadequate to avoid climate change - all of the major scientific studies released point to a need to cut our emissions by about 50% of 1990 levels, by 2020. In the face of all this evidence, a 5% target is insulting, laughable and completely unacceptable. Our behaviour once again threatens to undermine international consensus, making our finally signing the Kyoto agreement appear as a cynically political manouver rather than a genuine commitment to change. It MUST be changed before the Copenhagen conference.

As it has been explained to me, the CPRS is poorly designed and will do little, if anything to ensure that polluters change their behaviour. In fact, it seems to me to actually reward them for doing nothing. Our actions as individuals will not reduce Australia's emissions but will enable industry to increase their emissions. This is the very worst kind of politics, and the kind of behaviour that makes us an object of derision overseas.

An economy will not save us if our environment collapses; WE MUST act urgently to save ourselves (from our government, it seems).

Please do not let us down.

Emma Henderson

A 5% reduction in CO2 emissions is a joke!

If we do not make really significant changes, the consequences may be horrific (e.g. see New Scientist 28 Feb 2009, pp 29-35). We have to make a major reduction sooner rather than later.

We may be a small fish in the Ocean, but we can and should lead by example. The economic consequences of not acting are likely to be far more severe than any short-term hardship from our initial reductions.

Funds for economic stimulus should also be channelled into programs to develop and implement greenhouse abatement strategies, and low-carbon energy generation. The CPRS must encourage and promote deep reductions, not pandy to the wishes of ther coal industry.

Peter Sands

Australia needs to take a bolder stance on Climate Change. We have a chance to be leaders in this debate, not cravenly copping out by proposing a half hearted target. Politicians may only be in office for a small period of years in the greater scheme of things. But your inaction, or your weak willed proposal, will haunt our nation for generations to come. In those generations you will likely find your children and your children's children. Will they curse you for your legacy?

Yours faithfully,

Brian Twomey

Dear Senators,

The issue of climate change was the most important issue facing the Earth at the time of the last Australian federal election and it remains so. Little has been done, despite the Rudd government's mandate to act decisively. The imperative to act is increasing, partly because we have been collectively sitting on our hands and partly because the magnitude of change is clearly greater than had been anticipated. We cannot avoid pain in dealing with climate change but, as Stern and Garnaut have emphasised, the nations that move first will be the ones to reap the benefits of the new economy that must evolve. We need urgent, strong action.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Carey



The recent dramatic failures of the ice shelves in antarctica have once again highlighted the real impact that climate change is making. we are suffering a prolonged drought, the murray river is dying and it appears that you, the federal government, have all but given up on saving the coorong.

and yet, despite all of this, you propose a fundamentally flawed climate change policy that overcompensates polluters at the expense of community and the environment. this is not acceptable and it is not what you led the community to believe you would do during the election.

the proposed target of 5-25% is not at all adequate and will soon be made to look ridiculous both by the effects of the rate of change and by the efforts of other countries, even the united states who are examining far more dramatic cuts.

it is clearly evident that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought and it is paramount that our industry is strongly encouraged immediately to begin the process of change to reduce emissions. we do not have time to wait and in any event this would be foolhardy as other countries, particularly in europe, are already taking action which will give industries in those countries an advantage in future when our industries are still stuck in their old inefficient polluting ways. look at the example of the US car industry that for years, with the supportive of conservative administrations, successfully fought the introduction of tougher environmental controls on cars and now finds itself way behind the rest of the world and with dramatically falling sales as a result as people switch to more environmentally friendly alternatives.

the government's proposed policy is flawed and dangerous and will have terrible long term implications for australia's, environment, economy and culture. it must not be passed in its present form

yours sincerely

david helms

Having just read 'Quarry Vision' I realise your climate change policy is mostly smoke and mirrors. You will never change the coal industry unless you can stand up to them with guts. Why aren't you doing so much more for renewable energies? We need to make the changes in this country not pay for south-east asian nations to stop logging and then claim the credits. As far as I am concerned this is cheating.

Mary Cameron

Australia stands to lose more than many other countries as we are already a dry, hot land. We should be leading the way. We only get one shot to fix the problem of Global Warming and the current targets are a total fail. We need strong leadership on this issue because no matter what the short term cost of addressing the problem are, the long term costs are measurable as much more than just money. The long term cost will be catastrophic to humanity.

Ben Steele

This government is willing to make bold decisions regarding the Economy and Broadband network but is shy when it comes to the Environment.

The previous issues fade into insignificance compared to the global warming issue, what good is money had communicating if we leave a planet in crisis to our children and their children.

Get real you guys this is the issue you won government on and this is the one you are whimping out on.

I will make a prediction for the next election that if you don't start acting on climate change the green vote will increase dramatically and they will drag you kicking and screaming into the real world.

I don't know who is advising you people but they are way out of touch if they think a 5% reduction will suffice.

How about a bit of courage the people are ready to step up to the plate and make the sacrifices required to save the planet it is time the politician kept their promises.

Thanks for taking the time to read this email.

Regards

Manny Bellas

To whom it may concern,

Climate change? Unforeseen, detrimental effects to the natural environment of which all humans are totally dependent on for.

Is it good? No

Will it cost Australia's economy and the world economy to devise a plan than effectivley reduces our carbon emissions and reduce the impact of climate change? Yes, though whole new job sectors will be added with the consideration of renewable technologies.

Will it cost Australia's economy and the world economy to ignore the issue of climate change? Yes, alot more. At a guess, I would say trillions more and millions of lives more.

What would be the smart thing to do? Lead the way Australia and start the race for the largest country run on renewable energy sources, and the world would follow. It can be done.

With hope,

Mitch

Dear sir / Madam,

I am appalled that our Government has been so weak in their climate policies, given the mandate that they were given to address climate change and to lead and support the change over to a carbon neutral economy it seems that despite the rhetoric the Coal Lobby is still calling the shots. This Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed by the Government is a badly designed plan is no more than a licence for the situation to continue.

How dare they play "business as usual" with the future of the world our Children and our Grandchildren will inherit. It is time right now for this to end! We are part of this world, this problem, we are the world's largest per-capita emitters. We should be leading the way out of this mess and building a new economy, infrastructure and creating new jobs in new "Green" industries as we do it. We should be world leaders!

Lets do it!

I find the point made in the paragraph below to be a factor which is making me wonder if it is worthwhile investing in solar power for our home. Further, it seems to me that the program in Europe, (of providing a higher rate of payment for all renewable power generated and for a guaranteed 20 year period) would be an obvious strand in the way forward.

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.

P and M Jaggle

I've been following the Senate debates on climate policy, and can't believe greenhouse gas reduction targets have been set at a pathetic 5%! How can that possibly help us tackle dangerous climate change? And how can we, as a country, hold our heads high when asking other countries to act?

The reading I've been doing is scary. The greenhouse pollution reduction needs to be more like 50% by 2020.

I was aghast to learn that the Arctic summer sea ice will melt entirely within the next 5 years. In Antarctica, the ice bridge linking the Wilkins Ice Shelf and two islands snapped at the weekend.

The UN Conference on Climate change is in December; we only have a little time left to form important international agreements, and this low 5% target will only undermine those efforts.

From what I understand, "The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment." Is this true? I can hardly believe what I'm reading, Mr Garrett.

It certainly makes sense to set a strong target with a well-designed scheme to ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. Our economy will refocus to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

I've read "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."

I've recently had a baby; she was 14 weeks premature, and is now doing well. I can't believe that she will have fought her way into this world only to be battered by the legacy of bad decisions on climate change that the Australian government is party to. It's so important. I find it so distressing to think about.

Please, please help us be part of the solution.

Sandie Stewart

Hello,

Anthropogenic climate change is happening - and the effects are at the top end of the worst IPCC projections. The Wilkins ice shelf has just broken away from the Antarctic Peninsula. Now is the time for Australia to be a world leader and set targets for significant cuts in greenhouse gas emissions with no concessions for big polluters.

Lets not get left behind in Copenhagen this year.

Marc Allen



To the Senate Select Enquiry: The 5-15% target for reducing greenhouse gases is not adequate - please commit to a 50% reduction by 2020; and please take this improved target to Copenhagen. Also please reconsider your CPRS proposal as it over-compensates polluters at the expense of community and environment.

Sincerely,

Rhyll McMaster

I'd just like to let known my strong opinion regarding the current 5-15% target set. It must be improved before the Copenhagen conference in December, so Australia does not have a detrimental effect by undermining efforts there. 50% by 2020 should be the target. The CPRS currently proposed over compensates polluters & is a disgrace. It's time to refocus our economy, & become leaders in new growth areas such as renewables where Australia has so many resources.

I implore our Government to PLEASE take brave Leadership steps & take us as a country through the steps required to attempt averting environmental & hence humanitarian disaster.

Regards, Chloe Evans

Dear Sir / Madam

I write to raise my vigorous objections to the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS).

The CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, therefore 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 ridiculous. Modern levels of carbon emissions are not essential to human existence - technologies will be developed that allow us to live as we do without damaging the world's climate. Why would we close that door to ourselves? Let the Americans develop green technology and push their economy forward into independence from fossil fuels, while we sit quietly stuck in the 20th century with no motivation for our excellent scientists and other innovators to do anything? It is regressive, cowardly thinking and not the platform on which the Labor Government was elected.

Industry lobbyists may have the ear of the Government on this matter, but this is an issue where pure economics and industrial interest groups must not be allowed to hold sway. Due to our minimal fresh water resources, climate change is not just about things happening "somewhere else" - what would it mean if the recent drought was no longer a once-in-a-hundred-year event but the way our climate is from now on? An unviable Australian agricultural sector and therefore a weakened Australian economy, a population perpetually in danger of running out of water, an increase in natural disasters such as bushfires... These are the choices the Government is making.

The time to act on climate change is NOW, and I do not consider the current Government proposals to be in any way adequate. I call on you to go throw out the CPRS, and go back to the drawing board to come up with a better solution.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Spresser

5-15% is a weak target and shows no strength in the current Government. I have been travelling for the past year and have seen the shocking signs of climate change on each continent and in many varied climates. For a country that sees ourselves up there with the big players in the developed world we are a pathetic example and a country of sheep, stuck in the shadows and scared of the big economic powers.

Increase the target and don't be so short-sighted!!

Tom Keith

I'm deeply concerned by the governments weak action on climate change.

The Government's 5-15% target is NOT AT ALL ADEQUATE to avoid dangerous climate change. 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.

Personally, ours is not the most green-thinking, environmentally concious household. BUT despite that we are trying hard. We recently installed a solar hot water system and switched to energy saving lights. But with the current scheme over-compensating big polluters, I sometimes think WHAT IS THE POINT OF DOING THIS? It's so unfair.

I'm 25 years old now. I'm just very worried for the future.

Jeremy.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you because I am deeply concerned that the government's greenhouse reduction target of 5-15% is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. There is much scientific evidence that states we should be seeking much larger reductions in emissions (50% by 2020). I am also concerned that the proposed CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall and an action individuals and small businesses take to reduce emissions will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under the cap. And finally, Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement leading up to the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. I beg you to reconsider our targets and be strong on climate change action. It would not hurt for Australia to be a leader in this field for once and it would be a very strong indicator to the international community.

Yours sincerely

Will Stone

Hi,

Please make Australia a leader in greenhouse gas reductions policies. Scientists agree that a minimum of 25% reduction under 1990 level is necessary to avoid catastrophic climate change.

Australia needs strong policy at home and to support international progress in Copenhagen in December.

Also uranium mining in the desert is threatening water resources and life. Nuclear energy is NOT a green energy.

Go solar, Go wind power, Go geothermal and Go Anaerobic digestion.

Thanks for your time,

Noemi Desmarais

To Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy

I am very concerned about Australia's weak climate policy. This is probably the most serious global crisis the world has ever faced and as one of the top carbon emitting countries per capita, we need to take responsibility for our emissions.

We also need to face the fact that climate change is happening much quicker than originally thought, for example the loss of the Antarctic ice shelf that was reported yesterday, and scientists are now predicting that sea levels may be 6 metres higher by the turn of next century. This will mean huge scale land loss. Many low lying islands will disappear. As a large proportion of the cities & arable land in our country will be under sea water, there will be problems associated with famine and housing. Not to mention that the polar regions hold about 90% of the freshwater available on this planet, so water will be even more of a crisis for agriculture and drinking.

Miniscule reduction targets are not going to solve this problem. You are condemning future generations to an intolerable crisis which we can still avert if we take appropriate action NOW! We cannot allow large polluters to be allowed to buy their way out of their responsibility to the future and the environment. Emissions must keep falling or it will not make an effect on the overall carbon footprint that we now make. CPRS is akin to "robbing Peter to pay Paul" and will not serve any of us in the long run.

I implore you to make the hard decisions. The people of Australia and the world, will support them. Business will abide legislation and get on with the changes using sustainable practices if they have to. We must be inventive and show initiative to make some real progress on climate change. Everyone needs to realise that without an environment we don't have an economy, so which is more important?

So I beg you not to accept the Government's 5-15% target, and to proudly go to as representatives of the people of this country to The UN Conference on Climate Change with an unwavering commitment to reduce our greenhouse pollution to 50% (on 1990 levels) by 2020.

Ordinary Australians are behind a 50% reduction, and we want our government to do the right thing by future generations and focus on renewable energy, instead of allowing carbon polluters to continue.

Climate Change means we all have to Change!

Sincerely

Rhonda King



The present Governments proposed climate policy is grossly inadequate. It will fail to make any impact on climate change whilst undermining world efforts to reach international agreements to tackle the problem. We are at a major turning point in human history and as history has shown - those who insist on propping up or cling to the past will inevitably collapse with it. This is wonderfully exciting time with enormous opportunities -- at least for those who are not in fear of change. The ways that we have approached matters in the past have already changed dramatically. A prime example of this is demonstrated by the Governments own actions in dealing with the present financial crisis. It now make sense both financially and environmentally for the government to give to every house hold insulation batts hence creating employment whilst reducing our green house gas emissions. This alone shows how dramatically things have changed -- previously this would have been considered ins

ane. By using this example as a basis for our actions into the future it becomes obvious, the possibilities are enormous. Would it not be viable to consider offering solar hot water services to each house hold? Surely this would create new industries to make and service these hot water systems and by doing so create many thousands of jobs and stimulate our economy. This one measure would reduce Australia's electricity demand by a huge amount and hence dramatically reduce our green house gas emissions. Why not even go a step further and offer another solar hot water system to house holds and help install central heating systems or solar panels etc. At present the Governments targets are pathetic and even reward the large polluters. Rather than embracing the opportunities of the future they cling in fear to the past. It seriously concerns me and many others that I have spoken to that the Present Government's policy of a 5% \_15% reduction is not even to be considered separate t

o that achieved by individuals attempts to be more efficient. Hence the proposed gift of insulation whilst reducing our greenhouse gas emissions would only end up rewarding the big polluting energy producers by allowing them to sell on their permits for a profit. This surely means there is absolutely no incentive for people to strive to be more efficient. I surely hope as a result of this inquiry that the Government rethinks it's position and adopts a more forward looking, leadership role that most Australians could embrace with enthusiasm.

Yours sincerely

Barry Dickson

Our 5-15% target is a joke. There are plenty of really good innovative schemes in other places which would produce much greater reductions.

Instead of handing out money to all and sundry to no good effect why not use spend to facilitate greater use of clean technologies - grants for further development of alternative energy sources, financial encouragement to individuals and companies that lead the way.

The CPRS is pathetic - so many polluters can opt out - and it's bad psychology.

Better to reward people for doing the right thing than punish some for polluting and exempting other polluters

Robin Trouchet

Dear Comittee members

What is the point of anything if our climate changes to an unsafe state? Surely this is the time for governments to listen to scientists? We need much stronger targets. Greenhouse pollution should be 50% by 2020 (of 1990 concentrations)

Please lets take a strong, committed message to Copenhagen in December. We can do this, we can make the changes. I think the Australian public want to do at least their share globally.

Also whatever scheme is hatched in the end, individual and small business contributions to cutting emmissions must not be an excuse for industry to pollute more.

I think Australians and people everywhere will thank the government for putting us on a straight, fast road to cutting emmissions and transforming our energy economy. This is something humans can acheive. The CPRS is timid, shameful. We need to show courage and optimism and make much stronger targets.

Yours Faithfully

Rebecca Horridge

The Kevin Rudd Governments current policies designed to address climate change are dismal. I had hope when labour was elected that things would change for the better, with a more enlightened view on tackling major issues that will affect our country for decades if not centuries to come. So far my hopes have been dashed. The governments policies have not only been hopelessly inadequate in comparison with what the most well informed people around the world are saying is required, they look bad when compared with the Howard government's small measures, given the ever growing body of evidence about the damaging effects of doing nothing since the election.

Please start taking Australia's responsibilities to the world seriously.

Matthew Daly

Hi, I would like to say that we have to have a really long term view over climate change and how our use of resources is affecting ourselves and others. So far we keep putting our heads in the sand and thinking things will be OK because it is not affecting us, right now.

We are all interdependent and have to take responsibility for our actions, as if we d not, there will not be a future for our families or children, the planet will change forever and human life will be harder and harder to sustain because those in power prefer short term gain, whether political or economic.

So Australia, there are lots of us out here who really care and are doing our best to reduce climate change in our own small way. You have the power to do it in a big way, and you should because it is your responsibility to take care of the country, and be a responsible country in taking care of the world. To achieve great things you need great goals, having a 5 to 15% target on reducing greenhouse emissions is very mediocre, it makes very little difference. For everybody's sake, make a difference, make a BIG difference and commit to a big reduction in Australia's greenhouse emissions.

Thank you

Kevin Middleton

Dear Secretary:

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

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

Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy, not destroy jobs as the big polluters claim.[2]

Thank you for the opportunity to bring these remarks to your attention.

Mindful of the enormous responsibilities which stand before you, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Robert E. Rutkowski

[1] A joint CSIRO/Bureau of Meteorology study of the impact of climate change in bushfires found parts of Victoria faced up to 65% more days of extreme fire risk by 2020 and 230% more by mid-century.

[2] According to CSIRO economic modelling, 2.7 million new jobs will be created in Australia by 2025 if we set course to become carbon neutral by 2050.

Re:

Media Brief

[http://www.acfonline.org.au/uploads/res/CPRS\\_media\\_briefer\\_ACF\\_6-3-09.pdf](http://www.acfonline.org.au/uploads/res/CPRS_media_briefer_ACF_6-3-09.pdf)

We need to lead the world by committing to reducing our greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 so there will be a world for our offspring!

This is urgent and of utmost priority!

Yours sincerely

Dr Bev Jan

The government is pumping millions of dollars into the economy in an effort to limit the impact of the financial crisis.

Why not make an investment in the future of the world and build the renewable energy sector in Australia which will clearly be an area of growth in the short and long term.

Regards,

Gerry Healy



Please show that Australians wish to make a strong statement regarding global warming.

We are in a good position to lead by example by making more significant reductions to our impact on the environment.

I support a greater reduction on our carbon emissions than currently proposed.

Kind regards,

Patrick Donlon.

Why oh why does the dirty dollar always get in the way of a government's avowed environmental stand once they get into power!??\*

Stop being intimidated by big industrial interests and think of the future of your/our children and grandchildren...

Judith Hugo

Dear Mr Rudd and Mr Garrett

I am a marine ecologist and evolutionary biologist, with a PhD in tropical marine science and genetics. I voted for the Rudd government in the recent election, in part because of the Labor Party's environmental policy. I am writing because I am very concerned about the Australian Government's weak target for greenhouse gas emissions. The 5-15% target is completely inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Instead the government should be committed to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 - based on 1990 levels.

As a scientist working primarily on coral reefs and with a great interest in conservation I am highly concerned by the overwhelming scientific evidence showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. Major ice sheets are collapsing in Antarctica (one just last week) and the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

I am also horrified by the currently proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS), which is incredibly badly designed. It removes incentives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from communities and householders and will reward polluters - allowing them to maintain or even increase greenhouse gas emissions. I personally make considerable effort to reduce my carbon footprint - however, the proposed scheme will mean that my efforts (and those of other concerned individuals and businesses) will just enable polluters to increase production of greenhouse gases to that were not produced by myself and other responsible citizens. Thus, I strongly implore you to reinvent the CPRS so that it does not impose a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall. Then the actions of responsible individuals and small businesses to reduce energy can reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions and improve on any target the Government sets.

Australia's weak target for reducing greenhouse gases is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. It is imperative to set a strong target and combine this target with a well-designed CPRS scheme to ensure Australia takes responsibility and to avoid dangerous climate change. A good strategy now can make Australia a world leader in this very important social and political issue. For example, it will provide incentives to refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

I had great hopes that the Rudd government and in particular Senator Peter Garrett would be proactive and revolutionary in their responses to climate change policy. I am very disappointed in the current proposed targets for reducing greenhouse gases and the CPRS. Please rethink these proposals and make the changes essential for the social and environmental security of our planet.

Dr Vimoksalehi Lukoschek

Australia and the world need to drastically change our energy sources and transport options.

We need politicians with ticker to stand up to the dirty coal and petroleum industries.

Climate change is happening now - it doesn't rain much any more in Victoria. Average temperatures are measurably hotter. Polar caps are melting.

This is NOT a natural cycle - this is a myth espoused by the energy companies. What other time in the earth's history have fossil fuels been burnt?

So please, ensure reductions of at least 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

Andrew Arthur

Mr Rudd, based on your understanding of global trends, scientific, economic and popular, can you in any way conceive that climate change is not a 'real and present danger'?

The idea of preserving our natural environment is by no means a recent phenomenon that we must step back and analyse objectively before acting 'rashly'. The VAST majority of scientists around the world are in agreement that our planet is nearing the limits of its carrying capacity with our current living practices. Do NOT go down the same road as your predecessor and label this warning cry a 'bandwagon'. At least listen to your own people Mr Rudd! Ross Garnaut was commissioned at YOUR request, and yet you have entirely disregarded his sound advice of 25% reductions by 2020 (even if they are only from 2000 emission levels). The jury is no longer out. The evidence is here. We NEED to conserve our planet. We NEED to act NOW.

The people will be with you Mr Rudd. From best-selling literature such as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* to blockbuster Hollywood film, environmental preservation is well and truly established within popular knowledge. Merely examine the success of the 'green' market and you will be astounded by the popular momentum of ecological sustainability. As a populist leader, do you not think that it would be within your best political interests to also be far more environmentally conscious?

Then consider the economy. As leader of our nation a huge burden rests on your shoulders to foster our growing economic status, particularly in a time of such dire global financial turmoil. Because of your lack of support for renewable energy, Australia has lost "billions of dollars in investment and thousands of jobs" (*The Age*, 27/01/09) from foreign solar energy companies who were very eager to invest in our sunny country, but forced away because of your unwillingness. In a time of such serious economic instability, do you not see it as essential to create as many jobs and draw in as much revenue as we possibly can?

Mr Rudd, our country is in your hands. You told us during your election campaign that you would commit to saving the environment. PLEASE fulfill this promise!

In the words of the 1986 Brundtland Report "Sustainable Development must rest on political will". In this case that political will is YOUR will Mr Rudd. Be strong. Show the people who had faith enough to elect you that you can save our planet.

Yours with the utmost urgency and sincerity

Nicholas Grinpukel

As I see it, any scheme is always a balance between the needs of industry (profit) and the cost of overhauling/upgrading existing infrastructure to meet the targeted goal.

As long as we continue to see the problem as problem of "costs" then industry and profit will always have their way and the environment and society will continue to be degraded.

Commit to green power, make Australia the leader in new technology and not the slave to the decadent, outdated and polluting/costly oil/power industry.

Make the change for YOUR family and their descendants!

Cheers,

Roger Smith

We are ready for the government to take strong action- every day the government does not take strong action against climate change my view of this government as bringing hope, leadership and empowerment for the environment and consequently safety and security- diminishes.

Every day that this goodwill and readiness is not harnessed -sours us a little- so that when change is critical ( how can it not be more critical than now)- we will be in a position which is socially unsustainable as well as environmentally probably beyond the tipping point. We we will have lost so much ground - possibly literally- so many lives quite probably-and probably more species.

I have already paid a premium for wind power for many years but to do this I have dug deep-its not been easily affordable- I would like to make that count and not feel I am subsidising an industry to not make change- to do more of the same. I will use the stimulus money to buy solar hot water- I would like to make that count.

I can do these things - but I find it more difficult to account for the full carbon, social and environmental cost of my lifestyle- beyond buying Australian made (I know what the regulations are and its closer) or fair trade- less meat- this is all I can do and I imagine it is not enough. We now live in such a complex society- we need a system that can make each of the components accountable to the environment because it is beyond individuals to do it all. But we need that system to be a good one, one that we can believe in and support.

I don't want to be the only one of my neighbours doing all this- the solar hot water, the renewable energy-this-needs to be so normal it is past commenting on- the government has to lead - to use the economic crisis an opportunity to switch and build these industries that are more sustainable- to lead so that renewable power- is the norm. To lead so that the whole scope of environmental sustainability is embedded in our economic systems.

The CPRS could be the most crucial way of 'stimulating' that. I want the increased target- 50% by 2020, I want the CPRS to be designed so that more action not less is harnessed and made to contribute.

Even if it takes more personal effort- a CPRS that acknowledges the urgency ( made more evident by recent collapses of the ice shelf in the Antarctic) and all the other environmental signs that are indicating a great environmental change/possibly collapse of some systems- we want that effort to be made when it more timely.

I hope for the best outcome- our environment and a safe society are both too precious not to make these changes.

regards

Julianne Smart

To Whom It May Concern:

I am very deeply concerned about the governments lack of interest in climate change.

I think that we need to reduce our carbon emissions more than what you are suggesting.

The government should be doing every thing that they can to achieve this, there are many ways as you know, by turning of your lights etc,using public transport riding a bike or walking.

Please take notice of what the public is telling you and we can achieve this by being sensible.

Yours truly,

Maryellen Flynn.



The Government's 5-15% target is no where near adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

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

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

# 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,

Ian McLeod

I am extremely concerned about the plight of the earth's eco-system and the damage humans have made. As Australians we need to make a firm commitment to far higher greenhouse reduction targets to have some effect on the damage already done to the climate. I realise that this may be a tough political decision, but if not made then in the medium term (unfortunately this is not a long term problem any more), Australia, with the rest of the world, will be facing dire conditions.

As a business academic I see this as a great opportunity for our companies to be entrepreneurial and innovative in taking advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy, as well as developing new technologies for less waste and energy use in manufacturing.

Yours sincerely

Pam Morrison

Dear Climate Policy Inquiry Members,

Australia's current stance of 5% to 15% reduction of greenhouse gases by 2020 is entirely inadequate, and will inevitably lead to the rapid further deterioration of the earth's climate with melting of ice caps, huge and cataclysmic changes to weather patterns which will affect all parts of the world, including Australia.

I urge the Inquiry to examine in great detail what is proposed by the Rudd Government, and to expose the real outcomes of their weak policy. If Australia is serious about joining in meaningful discussions with other nations on the imperilled state of the world climate it must "put it's money where it's mouth is" and put forward serious and workable proposals for reducing out pollution and making everybody, including major polluters responsible for assisting in the reduction process. A 50% reduction on 1990 levels must be the aim for 2020.

Sincerely,

Neil R. Gill.

Come on, Kevin....be the prime minister that we all voted for and lead the world in climate change policy!

Sincerely

Martha Sheldon

I find the conservative Carbon reduction target proposed inadequate and urge you to commit Australia to a larger reduction - 50% by 2020 for the sake of our successors, the sake of the planet and the sake of our international reputation. I also find the current proposal rewards big business but not end users. In particular...

1. Many voted for this government on the expectation that they would would take real and strong measures to reduce carbon emissions - many of those are now feeling disappointed at the apparent lack of change;

2. NOW is a perfect time to commit substantial funds to Green infrastructure. It provides an economic stimulus, it addresses our national carbon footprint, and it makes the country cheaper to run in the long run. It is a economic and environmental INVESTMENT in the future and far better than cash handouts in my opinion;

3. It is cheaper to commit to a strong cut NOW - setting a low initial target means that steeper (and more costly) cuts need to be made at a later date;

4. There is very little in the current proposal to reward INDIVIDUALS for implementing their own Carbon reduction strategies. This should be addressed because very few individuals will seriously address the issue if they cannot see any benefit accruing to them.

I live in hope that progress will be made for ourselves, our children, our international reputation and the planet...

Dave Sutton

A large part of the Antarctic ice shelf fell off last week. This event alone should convince all reasonable people that the climate crisis is here, and now is the time to react very positively to a whole range of climate change initiatives.

Please add the main talking points too.

Regards, Caroline Power

I attended Greg Corbet's talk in Ballina this week. He stressed that the government's target was a start. BUT this start is too conservative for such a crucial issue. We **MUST DO MORE** to avoid climate change. I call on the government to take a stronger stand on reducing greenhouse pollution.

Helen Lockton

Is the climate around us changing? are our weather patterns becoming more extreme? Are many of our Pacific neighbours at risk of 'going under' literally as well as losing fresh water supplies to enable them to live on their 'disappearing' lands. the answer to all of these questions is a resounding YES! We need to do something NOW!

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

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

Regards

Dianne Stevens



Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to urge Australian Politicians to recognise that Climate Change is the biggest danger we are facing in the very near future. It will affect every single living thing on this planet. We are on the critical moment where we could do something about it before it is too late. I think it is ridiculous to think that the current targets would have the necessary effect to stop the damaging effects climate change will cause. And I think it is very clear that the public does want some strong action from our leaders to protect our future and the future of our children.

We need tougher targets and more restrictions for heavy polluters and investment in renewable energy. And we need it NOW.

Thank for your time

Ana Martin

I am so disappointed by Labors weak targets of 5-15%. I am appalled this is NOT what I voted for.

I know if we were led well by government the public would handle it. We could achieve 50% by 2020 with a mix of pain and gain- this is a time for change, real change. People are jostled in any case by the financial situation so let us embrace change. I want much higher targets!

I don't want CPRS it is not good enough - I am having solar panels installed in my home, but I am totally disheartened as I know this saving could be traded away - even so I spend 14,000 of MY money.

Please please insist on new targets and a new scheme

Jane McNeillage

Dear Enquiry Members,

Some of my hopes were dashed when the current Government decided on short term gain rather than long term commitment in regard to addressing climate change. This for me is worse than the inaction of the previous government whose ideological stance, disdain for alternative views and political manoeuvring, meant a decade of things getting worse. To have a political party promise to take meaningful action and then offer so little, in the face of dire circumstances is I think willful ignorance.

As one of the largest emitters per capita on this planet, I felt disgraced by the low targets the Government set for reducing greenhouse pollution. At least a 50% reduction by 2020 (on 1990 levels) is needed. With daily reports of the effects of climate change, unstable weather patterns resulting in 'disasters', the loss of ice at the poles, small island communities being threatened by sea rise, the difficulty farmers are having germinating seeds, changes in soil biology... and the list goes on... the only ethical solution is for Australia to take responsibility for the situation here and contribute to global solutions.

A Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) should support ALL efforts - individual, business, community, corporation and government to live, work, produce and trade so that it doesn't cost the planet. Many individuals and groups are already carrying on environmentally sensitive operations. These need to be recognized and supported, rather than giving large polluters a free ride.

As a certified organic farmer who produces food for a local trading network, powered through solar energy, harvesting my own water & managing my waste as well as returning carbon to the soil through sustainable practices, I see no reason why those businesses that have in the past been environmentally destructive should be assisted by a government scheme to continue with such practices.

Please use your voices to design a scheme that is fair and effective. Don't underestimate the support in local communities for looking after our environment and contributing to global action on climate change.

Thanks for your time

Maree Bracker

I want to see 50% by 2020. It is absolutely my top priority of all political priorities.

I want a scheme whereby we are not trading away our own savings but somehow ALL savings are rewarded not traded

thank you

Jane McNeillage

I would urge the Government to reconsider its Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. Specifically, I believe the emission targets set are not adequate to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution.

I was dismayed to hear that the Wilkins ice shelf in the Antarctic is breaking up. Given this significant event, I believe that more stringent action is required to halt greenhouse emissions.

Please reconsider these targets. Other countries will follow our lead and we must propose a stronger target example.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Cass

Dear Government,

A 5% emissions target is not what I voted for a year and a half ago.

Please honour your promise in word and intent.

Not having a high income, I don't have so much to lose but I am prepared to lose it on behalf of the planet I love.

Jozy Sutton

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to request that you reconsider the 5-15% target for greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. Given that the scientific research into climate change is stating very strongly that the predictions made a few years ago on the rate of climate change is rapidly being overtaken at a greater speed, we need to act to reduce the impacts quickly and effectively.

I have been very impressed so far with the German Govt stance on tackling climate change and how it has assisted the development of sustainable technology industries in that country.

We now find that even the USA is taking on board the urgency of this global challenge and may leave Australia behind in its efforts to be a part of the solution.

Please ensure that there are incentives in place for small businesses and individuals to reduce their energy consumption and promote and reward their green ethics and practices.

I hope we will be a positive contributor at the Copenhagen conference as we have been in the global collaborations to tackle the current financial crisis.

yours faithfully,

Lorraine Perrins

Please make Australia a technology leader, innovater and exporter so we can address global warming and economic stability as one.

Kevin Bell



Dear Sirs,

Every day it becomes more apparent that the Governments 5 - 15% target on reducing Australia's greenhouse gases is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollutin by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change and most importantly it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy and make sure that Australia is not left behind other developed countries in the area of creation of green colar jobs.

Change is inevitable, it is our responsibility to decide if Australia is amongst the leaders in the field or will latch onto what is unavoidable, when other countries have snapped up lucrative clean & clever growth industries.

Please do your bit to save Australias future.

Thank you.

Yours Sincerily,

Anja Voss

While the world panics about the "Financial crisis", I implore you to see further into the future than your terms in office.

We need MUCH stricter emissions targets. All of the things you currently battle with daily; immigration, family issues, budgets, terrorists etc. are drops in the ocean when compared to the bleak outlook a 5-15% reduction provides.

We need:

1. Massive funding in renewable energy.
2. A optimised electricity delivery and storage systems to cope with new "fluctuating" sources.
3. Penalties for business who do not abide to STRONGER targets.

In hope,

Tom Anderson

My family have always been Labor and Green voters, but clearly we have made the wrong choice in putting our faith in Labor. The absurdly small 5% target laid down by Labor for greenhouse cuts is TOTALLY unacceptable in light of the horrific predictions for the future of Australia and the world if climate change continues on its current path. The target is a betrayal of my generation. The proper, responsible targets (40-50% by 2020) may harm the economy in the short term, but that harm will be nothing compared to the effects (economic and otherwise) of climate change on the world. The CPRS is poorly designed, serving only to shift focus away from the heavy polluters, and it is an absolutely shameful display of corporate-minded greed and blindness, flying in the face of election promises and all reason. It undermines any authority Australia may have in international climate change negotiations, and it undermines any faith I had in the government. I reject Labor. You won't be re

ceiving my vote.

Tom Jenkins

I am particularly concerned about the design of the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, which has allowed for free permits for some of our major polluters, then seems to allocate community efforts to their accounts. I have been a supporter of Victoria's efforts to support community members to make their own reductions, and believe this is a responsible approach--share the "burden" across all sectors of the community and create mutually-reinforcing strategies. Counting community efforts in favour of holders of free permits is both bizarre and inappropriate. Especially given that we can expect the holder of a free permit to pollute might not focus their attention on delivering not only their own cuts but ours as well!

As a country we have been ashamed by our Governments' approach to international discussions on climate change. We thought we could regain some pride, as well as some authority, once we had signed the Kyoto Protocol, but the establishment of such weak targets puts us back into the nay-sayer camp.

There has been a lot of public discussion lately about the generational impacts of debt, and our responsibility not to pass on debt to future taxpayers. This is all fine. But it is also our responsibility to do what we can about carbon pollution now, lest we pass on not only the cost of making steeper cuts in the future, but also the environmental and economic impacts of our failure to act.

Alison Hallahan

There needs to be some sensibility about this, and long term planning.

It seems daft to me that in this country we can produce a lot of the product we import, and that the transport and distribution from afar adds significantly to the greenhouse effect.

I am heartened about improved rebates and incentives for insulating homes and converting to solar. There is huge potential for the benefits of solar power for domestic use - look at Germany's lead here.

I feel it's up to the Government to get tough on heavy polluters and reward those who make a change in the right direction.

Mark Barnett



I understand that reaching a limit of 5% will be extremely difficult.

BUT putting the upper cap at 15% is much to low.

Our goal will need to be ZERO and 15% is not close enough to that.

Please consider 5-50% target.

Thanks

Joum

The Government won a mandate at the last election from the people of this nation to act toward turning Australia around from the direction it had been travelling on climate change and greenhouse reduction. There was much hope in the homes of many average Australians that we as a nation would finally lead the world on an important issue and not just follow others in bad, ill thought out policy.

Australia leads the world in many forms of alternate energy and clean coal technology which could help build an enormously strong economy in the future. Not only could this technology help us in Australia but we would also be exporting the technology, further strengthening future revenue.

I know of many Australian companies that lead the world in alternate energy technology but are proving their products off shore, often because of greater Government assistance. Some of these companies are doing it extremely tuff at the moment because of the global financial crisis and this is where our Government should be stepping in to help and thus protecting potential future industries that will support thousands of Australian jobs.

Instead, we pander to the polluters, who will change if forced by good policy. This change obviously won't happen overnight but it must occur on a level playing field with a strong CPRS and serious greenhouse reduction targets.

I am biased in the area of renewable energy as I have put my own small amount of money into investing in companies that specialise in everything from Geothermal energy to Hydrogen fuels and artificial photosynthesis, to name a few. The ironic thing, is that all these companies are considered high risk investments. The only high risk that I see for the future is if we continue to rely on fossil fuels to power our economy.

I am certainly hopeful that many of these companies will become household names in Australia in the near future which will mean that we are finally going in the right direction, but this will not only take hard work on their part but a lot of luck and significant investment and support from the current Government.

Good leadership will always anger some, but great leadership is picking which people to anger for the greater good of all.

Matt Anderson



Dear Mr Rudd,

I am hugely disappointed in the Federal Government's Climate Change policies. I think it's time to go back to the drawing board. I know that we are in the middle of an unprecedented financial crisis and we need to protect jobs. However I feel we now have an excellent opportunity to change the type of jobs to those that will be needed in the future. We desperately need to start encouraging green jobs.

The current rebates for solar hot water and solar panels are wonderful and make it affordable to many householders who couldn't manage it in the past - myself included. There is an industry growing up of solar specialists, plumbers, electricians, welders, etc. who are all involved in this industry. The emissions savings should become part of our national target. This grass roots solar industry should be encouraged by making the rebates available to all (whatever their income) and making the tariffs attractive to people feeding energy back into the grid, like they have in Germany. If only half the households in Australia had an interactive solar system, it would reduce demand for supply and in the process coal energy emissions would reduce by a substantial amount.

This country should not be dependent on coal exports to countries which are notorious for emitting high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. I realise this is a situation which has developed over many irresponsible years and it's hard to turn it back. But we can have a phased cutting back. We need to show some leadership in the Asia Pacific Region. We also need to encourage our population to stop over-consuming. There is a big difference between what you want and what you need. The days of rampant consumerism have to go. This planet cannot afford it.

I also think you need to look seriously at the way our food is transported over long distances. This situation has arisen because of the stranglehold the major supermarkets have on the fresh food industry. It's ridiculous that small local growers can't supply the supermarkets because they would need to guarantee supply to most of Australia. Something needs to be done about carbon miles in the fresh food industry. That would really help the cut in emissions.

Maria Hitchcock

Dear Senators,

Regarding the Government's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme I would like you to consider the following:

The CPRS currently proposed by the Government is manifestly inadequate. the Government's 5% target will do nothing to mitigate dangerous climate change.

The scheme is badly designed and will do more harm than good. It overcompensates big polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

The weak target is undermining efforts to conclude important international agreements and must be improved before the climate change conference in Copenhagen.

Setting a stronger target within a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia contributes to reducing the harm caused by climate change. it will also help refocus the economy to take advantage of new industries in renewable energy.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Robert Hogg

The allocation of govt stimulus money to insulation and/or solar hot water installation is great, but let's go further. Include house ventilation, insulation paint, water tanks. Also, let's inject money into solar thermal power plants, mass commercial and industrial green retrofits, electric/hydrogen powered cars, more public transport, etc.

The targets have to be greater - don't leave policy and regulation changes until it's WAY to late.

Sara

Climate Change needs to be addressed, and a wishy washy approach is certainly not the address it needs.

It needs BIG BOLD letters on the front of the envelope.

If there were a war, and the people of this country were under serious threat, how would you, our government respond.

This is what we face, and we need you, as our government to take REAL action.

The European Union and the U.S. are now taking steps, REAL steps to make REAL change, they are acting as statesmen for their countries.

We have the opportunity to help lead the way, to support rather than undermine the efforts of those leaders who are taking REAL action.

Not only can we help to save the world, but we can set up industries which fuel the economy sustainably.

What are we waiting for?

Theresa Taylor

The Government must take the climate change threat seriously and increase the pathetic 5% target to 50% by 2020. The Wilkes Ice Shelf disaster, amongst many other very frightening indicators, should make the government realize that time to act is short.

Australia is well positioned to take advantage of renewable energy technology. I want our Government to stop pandering to the dying coal industry and re-position our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. Where are the solar power subsidies? Where are the compulsory rain-water tanks? Where is a realistic greenhouse reduction target?

Marg Beal

Dear Madam / Sir,

You are the filthiest polluter on earth, along with every other Australian citizen.

5% is not enough, and don't try to kid me that the 15% (still a joke) is even in contention otherwise the 5 would never have got a mention, so let's get real.

The United States Of America has a new leader, and he's turning the powers that be line of thought out and putting the line of thought ' of the people' in action, with many social changes including climate change legislation.

You, being the very ones that ' can make decisions for radical social change' can now go " All the way with USA" and start by Cutting emissions " as much as possible!"

We can never catch up to the cleanest citizen it seems, we can try.

The CPRS needs to be thrown out completely! It's a joke, a kow tow to industry, and it's time to forget about industry and start thinking ' clean' times change industries close down everyday and enterprising many grabbers start another way of doing things, and that ' will ' happen. We need massing spending on solar power stations now. We Lost the best man to build them from Govt policy of ' go away we like coal and Howards lemming like tunnel vision to follow Bush to the very end' while a quiet revolution is going on in California along with other states to go green on energy.

**WE CAN DO THAT!**

It's up to you to let your head go and aim for the sky.

Have some Vision, Please.. Your's Neil Castles

There will be no economy, no jobs, even no politicians to get things wrong if we do nothing or very little about climate change we need to do what is right for the world.

Lets not follow Nero's example and play music while the earth sinks in the west.

Make a difference NOW!!!

John Brooks father of 5 grandfather to 10.

I am an Emeritus Professor of Marine Geoscience. Since the late 1960's, I have dedicated much of my research towards studies of the geological history of Earth's climate variability. The trends in climate change that I now see happening, and the most likely related exponential annual increases in global emissions, worry me deeply. We need to do all we can, pull out all stops, to cut greenhouse-causing emissions before Earth possibly reaches a "tipping-point" (for example, sudden release of permafrost methane) that could devastate humanity. Governments are simply not doing enough

Professor Chris vonderBorch



Dear Mr Rudd,

I agree with you on so many things but, alas, I feel that you are really compromising Australians and Australia's future with the weak response to the grave global climate change which threatens to devastate us sooner rather than later!!! We must take drastic action now and we must lead and be seen to lead. We must have courage.

I am no scientist but I try to read what the scientists are telling us and the evidence is all around us and increasingly so. Please increase your Government's target to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by at least 50% by 2020.

Our hopes and the hopes of generations to come rest on today's Governments' decisions! Please act...

Mary Taaffe

I work in the nature conservation industry, and I am deeply concerned about the Governments inadequate climate policy and the massive repercussions that will result for the Australian environment and the people of Australia.

I believe we should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels)

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is likely to do more harm than good - here in my home town of Castlemaine there is strong local government and community action on climate change - the CPRS as it is currently framed undermines community activity to the benefit of the major industrial polluters.

If we as a nation take set our sights on a strong target we will help to drive change at an international level - the signs of rapid climate change are now obvious around the world - I am seeing signs in the North Central region of Victoria where I work and are deeply concerned for the biodiversity, ecosystems and the people they support.

Please do not sacrifice the long-term well being of Australia and the world for short term outcomes - overtime it will be the alternative sources of energy that will power our economy - I am worried about the future we are leaving my three children - please take strong and wise action now.

Yours sincerely, Tim Read

The present target of 5 - 15% by 2020 is certainly insufficient to avert catastrophic carbon build up.  
At 86, the catastrophe will not affect me, but it will affect my children and grandchildren - and yours!

Waiting until World public opinion catches up with reality will make catastrophe inevitable.

We should be leaders, not part of the following rabble.

Peter Watney

The Governments target range is too low to be effective, and demonstrates that Governments are clearly captives of big business, and in this case the big polluters.

Further, that efforts made by individuals to reduce carbon emissions will not be on top of reductions required by industry is just appalling.

Any farsighted Government should see the imperitives imposed by human induced climate change as an opportunity to provide jobs in new areas, not to be propping up industries that have got us here in the first place.

Anthony Haslam

The 5-15% target is totally inadequate. This is something that even Mr Howard might have agreed to. It undermines international efforts to address this crucial problem and makes a mockery of Labor pre-election rhetoric.

Tad Boniecki

The Government's 5-15% target is woefully inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. New scientific findings show that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed by the Government is badly designed and over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. Economic stimulus is wasted if our environment collapses. Climate change is our most urgent global problem. I urge the government to direct economic stimulus towards long term clean energy and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Sincerely

Diana Killen

It is just not good enough for you,'our Government' to think that a 5% reduction in immissions is anywhere near what it required to have any possibility of impacting on our climate change responsibilities.

You need to step forward and create a leadership frontline policy of 20% reduction by 2020. We as a nation with so much going for us environmentally need to and can afford to make this commitment.

Savaad Wells

I've put up the PV cells on the roof we drive one car and ride bikes the house sun oriented with well above standard insulation. Ive cut electricity consumption by 100%. Now its your turn 5% is weak! Nothing else. You have to do better.

Michael O'Doherty



It is certain that the 5-15% target is inadequate to preserve future generations from the difficulties of Climate Change. Please consider whether a target of at least 35% is not both more appropriate and yet politically achievable

Thank your

Philip Robinson

Dear Sirs,

I am very concerned that the low targets for greenhouse pollution reduction being set by the government will not be sufficient to demonstrate to other countries that Australia is serious about climate change. Climate change is a global problem, weak targets from a developed nation will allow our trading partners (particularly China) to argue that they can also adopt low targets.

The CPRS is also badly designed - the notion that households reducing their carbon footprint create more "room" for industrial polluters shows that the basic design is flawed. I voted for the ALP because I thought they could be better trusted than the Liberals to deal seriously with climate change. I am beginning to suspect my view was ill informed.

Phillip Edwards

The Australian Government needs to make two major changes to its current policy. Firstly, there must be a binding commitment to a greater reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Spending some of the current financial crisis "war chest" on effective action in this area would do more good than building more roads and bridges! Secondly, the government must listen to and act on the advice of real experts who are pointing out that the Carbon pollution reduction scheme is designed more to protect the worst polluters in our society than to really save our environment.

Bob Cook

To the Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy and the Exposure Draft of the Carbon Pollution Scheme Legislation.

I would like to strongly voice my support for strengthening Australia's position on greenhouse pollution and carbon pollution reduction. Now is not the time to continue to debate the perceived economic disadvantages that may occur if we do not make a stronger commitment to reducing our impact on climate change. It is certainly not the time to listen to industry positions instead of ordinary citizens.

Australia has led the way in the development of some renewable power technologies such as solar power. This has paved the way for multi million dollar industries and proves that renewable technology is viable economically.

The target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution although a start is inadequate to address what is the largest threat to our planet -please consider this policy carefully. We will be judged by future generations on our lack of action at this crucial point in time.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Kerrie Jones

I am concerned that the CPRS is inadequate in design.

Namely:

1. I consider that a higher target is warranted, in light of the threat of climate change.
2. A higher target will stimulate further response from the international community.
3. The existing CPRS seems to undermine individual effort. My household purchases 100% Green Power, with the extra cost involved. However, based on the proposed scheme, this will merely provide cheaper permits for polluters. Any scheme should categorically address this problem.

Jason Sharland

To whom it may concern,

This is the 21st century, and Australia is a 1st World country, with huge intellectual and scientific resources. Surely we can make use of assets and come up with a REAL commitment to reducing carbon emissions and the resulting environmental impact via climate change. Greenhouse emission targets need to reflect the needs of the planet and all its inhabitants; not merely the weak policies of government. A reduction in greenhouse emissions needs to aim for a massive reduction. This government needs vision and initiative; not a continuation of the old school of thought that got us into this environmental disaster in the first place. Aim for at least a 50% reduction by the year 2020. Already we are seeing unprecedented environmental changes that go beyond those predicted and projected by the 'experts'. It's time to take drastic measures to meet the level of need. Not token gestures!

Thanking you for your time,

Michelle Thompson

I have been significantly disappointed in the Governments response to climate change. You have one of the greatest environmental activists of our time (Mr Peter Garrett) within your administration and yet you cant take a strong enough stance to make some strategic and significant changes for the sake of our environment.

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

We need to set an example for the international community. You do not want to have history documenting our mediocre approach to our crisis. Surely it is in all our best interest to be at the forefront. Australian's are smart and innovative - we can find ways to develop new products and approaches in order to meet our targets if just given the option or imperative.

I am also concerned about the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme as I feel that it over compensates polluters. We need to work with big business to help them change their production processes in order to pollute less. We also need to invest more time and thought into renewable energy sources.

I have just finished building my own home and at my own expense (with a rebate which I thank you for very much) installed solar panels that provide energy for about half my house. I am hoping to scale this up over the coming years. There is a number of people in the community like myself who are doing what we can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but we would like to see the same commitment from this Government who rode it's way into power on the back of the green vote.

Thanks for letting me have my say.

Kind regards,

Rosalinda Batson

The government's current target of 5-15% is completely unacceptable in the face of growing evidence that the need to reduce carbon emissions is URGENT! As if the huge crack in the Antarctic ice shelf is not enough, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is poorly designed and over compensates the polluters at the expense of the environment.

We must set a much stronger target. This is the reason I and many of my friends and family voted for the Rudd government.

Thank you for listening

Robin



I find it disheartening and disappointing but also terrifying that we are faced with the possibility of major disaster if we continue as we always have, putting our immediate gains ahead of overall good. 5-15% reduction of greenhouse gasses is NOT ENOUGH. We must reduce it by at least 50% even if that means a major change in our lifestyles. We have been living way beyond our means for at least the last century!

I can not believe that it is not clear to everyone that we have to turn away from coal. I know this is a coal based economy but it is time to change. We need to focus on RENEWABLE ENERGY. We should put the money into this instead of throwing money away to prop up the old polluting industries through the ridiculous idea of "clean coal" or the "clean option" of nuclear power (what about the waste?!!! - that is not clean and even though we wouldn't have to deal with it for quite awhile it will still be there for the future generations)> If we embraced renewable energy and just learned how to live without over consumption we would really get somewhere and we would be able to pass on this wonderful world to our children.

The CPRS compensates polluters but doesn't take into account that as individuals and small business work towards becoming greener and cleaner the polluting industries can continue to increase their greenhouse emissions.

Please think about this and try to make the tough decisions. Let's be a leader in this change. It will be hard but these are hard times and it will just get harder the longer we put it off.

Lynden Jacobi

The Government is not ambitious enough in its target of 5-15% reduction in carbon emissions. A target of 50% by 2020 is more appropriate to the serious environmental crisis that we are facing. Current weather events and the reduction of ice in the Arctic and ice shelves in Antarctica point to an unprecedented rate of change in the planet's climate systems. It seems that these events are tracking the worst case scenarios of the IPCC. It is imperative that Australia acts decisively and makes strong reductions on our carbon emissions as soon as possible.

I am concerned about the current structure of the CPRS scheme which does not seem able to include smaller scale reductions in carbon emissions and energy conservation. It seems that under this scheme, any action that I take in my own household will allow carbon polluters to increase their emissions. This seems like a poorly structured scheme and I would favour a scheme that allows individuals to take action to reduce their carbon footprint at the same time as industry is mandated to reduce their impact as quickly as possible.

yours,

Tracy Bourne

I'm not the kind of person who generally gets involved in this protest-y type stuff, but the seriousness of this matter has spurred me to action.

I studied Civil & Environmental Engineering at university and as such have been learning about climate science for a long time before it hit the media and it was cool to be "green".

I believe the principles of fairness and justice demand that we do something to halt the emissions which scientists tell us which have the potential to rob our children and those in poorer countries of a future. Australia is emitting more than it's fair share and I think it's only right to remedy this.

I understand that the proposed cap & trade system will mean any savings in emissions I make will be essentially transferred to industry, which I find unfair to the extreme. I understand a basic carbon tax would avoid this problem, whilst still putting a price on the externality of carbon emissions. I also expect that this system would be significantly easier to regulate and comply with (reducing a large portion the burden of compliance reporting from business). I also understand that this system would have greater scope for integration with any other carbon emissions reduction programs enacted by other governments. The fact that I will be compensated by the government for any increase in cost to my electricity etc due to the implementation of the CPRS seems mad and offers no financial incentive to reduce my usage.

I'm trying to do my bit to and would appreciate it if you would support me from a higher level. I know that this is politically very difficult, but it doesn't mean it's not worth doing. Australia has grown some of the worlds most innovative solar scientists, but has unfortunately lost them to other countries whose government support them.

I think our targets should be stronger, support from the government for "green" technologies should be more and the system implemented by our country to motivate reductions in emissions should be equitable (not allowing my savings to be passed on to industry).

Kind regards,

Kate Beard

5-15% target is a weak option. Why not make a concerted effort and instead of going with the flow we can be a world example, thus improving our global image/reputation and perhaps making a substantial difference.

The CPRS is loose and poorly designed and actually allows industry to increase their emissions under that proposed cap.

If we are to go to the Copenhagen climate change conference in december and have a leg to stand on we need to increase our greenhouse targets and have something substantial we can stand by on an international stage.

Regards,

Sam Boase.

Weak targets of 5% will be too little and 2020 is too late.

We may not have an earth worth saving if we do not take decisive action

The melting of the ice shelf in Antarctica this week is another warning that we do not have the time to delay action.

Not enough Australians understand cprs and how it will work to change the environment. We need an education campaign to change this situation. If we do not see ourselves in this scheme than it wont work.

Billie and Bill Vlies

As one of the highest per-capita producers of greenhouse gas in the world, we should be aiming higher with our greenhouse emission targets; that is to say, we should be attempting to cut deeper.

It's all possible if we only have the political will. I'd be willing to accept higher energy costs if that's what it takes to cut deeper. We should be trying to set an example, not drag our heels.

Peter Dann

To whom it may concern,

The pathetic response for the reduction in carbon emissions is once again an indication of the weakness of this government to make hard and politically sensitive decisions. We have in our midst a once in a lifetime opportunity to attack the very cause of climate change and the government by all accounts has been swayed by big business and polluters. The financial crisis is a blessing for installing change not for continuing with antiquated industries and strategies. The time has come to shift away from coal, and this means Australia needs to take a strong and positive approach, we cannot dictate to the developing world if we as a nation are still advocating coal use and embracing the pathetic and misinformed objective of "clean coal". Renewable power needs to become a major industry within Australia, and this means in terms of both production of power, R&D and manufacturing. Why can't Australia lead the world in solar, wind, geo-thermal, tidal and wave power? Well the short an

swer is because we have a government that looks at 4 year time frames and sweeteners to keep themselves in power. I implore you to undertake tighter reduction targets, with substantial aids to the polluters to convert or source power from renewable sources (i am positive that if heavy polluters were sourcing renewable energy then , for this to happen some incentives are required and this \$42billion of stimulus should have gone towards just that, unfortunately again the short term gain has been chosen over the long term goal. The Australian government has a chance to shape the future of Australia without being dependant upon coal, it also has an opportunity to bring pressure on the global community by setting achievable but high reduction targets. Australia can lead the world, please do not squander this once in a lifetime chance, otherwise maybe four years is the timeframe you will be regretting.

Regards

Jarrold Wynn

To whom it may concern,

The proposed climate policy put forward by the government is deeply flawed and does not constitute a serious attempt to avert dangerous climate change globally. A minimum target of 25% reductions in greenhouse gases is required by 2020, with a 40-50% reduction more in line with the balance of scientific evidence.

In addition this target should be set to each industry sector (manufacturing, agriculture, residential etc.) to ensure each sector contributes and adopts best practices, and does not 'piggy-back' on others meeting or exceeding their targets.

Renewable efficiencies, especially solar, need to be assisted in establishing competitively in the marketplace, through the mechanisms of a gross feed-in tariff, and permanent and elevated renewable energy targets.

Regards,

Jake Urlus



Dear Poly

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

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

Please do something to push our government into making some meaningful policies regarding reductions in greenhouse gas. People of themselves will not do enough (me included) thus we need to be led by government to save ourselves.

Cheers,

Will

Dear Sir/Madam

I have taken dramatic steps to decrease my personal greenhouse gases and I expect the government to do the same. As a rich, well educated nation we have the opportunity to do this with little impact on our lives.

The governments weak stance on climate change undermines my efforts and even goes so far as to allow big industry to carry on with business-as-usual when i make deeper emission cuts. I demand the government takes greater steps in preventing further climate change and be accountable.

- Raise the target to 25% or more
- Create a simpler and more effective CPRS.
- Stop subsidising industry that pollutes.
- Do not include voluntary household emission reduction actions such as solar hot water and solar panels in the MRET target.
- Do not impose a emissions floor in the CPRS, that is just plain crazy!

Yours sincerely

Justin Smyrk

Our world is under increasing pressure we need stronger and more intense reaction from governments. In the driest continent on Earth, building water holding structures, the use of solar and hydro power plus solar/electric vehicles is not a luxury it is a necessity. We need all of these projects to have started yesterday. Please acknowledge and begin, NOW.

Regards,

Shaun Newman

I write to urgently ask you to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. The current target that the government has is woefully inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

The weak target that Australia currently has is undermining efforts to form critical international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The current scheme proposed by the Australian government is badly designed and will do more harm than good. It 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 also think that investing in renewable energies and climate change strategies would be a useful way to stimulate the Australian economy.

Please have the courage to take a strong stand on climate change, and put the environment and community before industry polluters.

Kirsten Campbell

I am deeply disappointed and concerned at Labors 5-15% target to reduce greenhouse emissions by 2020. I feel misled and cheated by Labor after they secured my vote in November '07 with their perceived commitment to the environment. The proposed target sends the wrong message to the world that Australia isn't taking climate change seriously. I feel Kevin Rudd & Penny Wong have sold out to coal industries & other polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

Labor needs to get its priorities right. Nothing is more important than climate change; not education, not high speed broadband, not even the economy. The economic situation will get far worse if steps aren't taken to put in place a serious target of 50%(on 1990 levels). We are already suffering from climate change. This year alone has seen unprecedented natural disasters. Floods in QLD & NSW. Fires, although lit by arsonists, rage with ferocity not seen before. This will set a trend that will continue. Our food supply & edible commodities will continue to suffer & become increasingly expensive.

President Obama has the foresight to see the growth of green industries and the potential for millions of jobs in this area.

I urge the Senators to ensure Prime Minister Rudd commits to reducing Australia's greenhouse emissions by 50% by 2020 and to make a serious committment to technology and research of renewable energy and green industries.

Thank you

Deborah McLaughlin

Dear Government

I am delighted that Prime Minister Kevin Rudd has announced a scientific enquiry into carbon capture. I would like to urge him and the committee to read the recently published report by independent scientists at the ANU that states our biodiverse old growth forests store carbon in the soil and in the forests at incredibly higher rates than was previously thought. Thus far, the government has ignored the value of our biodiverse forests-for example the Tarkine, The Weld and the Upper Florentine in Tasmania. It is with alarm I notice that the Wilkins icesheet has broken away from the antarctic ice-surely a wakeup call for the government to take effective action to protect our existing biodiverse old growth forests, and to encourage energy efficiency, public transport and green renewable energy.

Yours sincerely

Annie Costin

I write to urge the government to increase the target to lead the international efforts in reducing greenhouse pollution.

Regards

John Choi

Dear Committee Members,

Let's get serious. 5% is a pathetically low target and will only increase complacency and cynicism with respect to climate change. Frankly, it doesn't sound like a serious enough problem (which it is) to warrant a serious solution (which 5% isn't). Australia has been the butt of international jokes on environmentalism for years. Let's lift our game and lift our reputation too.

Yours truly,

Randall Pearce



The facts are scary and cannot be ignored. The technology to mitigate the carbon emissions is available e.g. biochar (carbon negative!!).

Yes, the capital start-up costs are large but by localising electricity production and optimising our waste disposal there is opportunities to create more jobs, educate people with information previously mis-understood and maintaining a cleaner world.

Please re-consider the emissions target and increase it to at least a reduction of 50% by 2020.

Regards,

Joel Hextall

Please reconsider the 5% target for Australia - this insignificant percentage will do little to combat the danger we are facing. Surely, the collapse of the ice sheet this week is a clear example of what is happening and this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Yes, there will be a financial cost but considering the future costs in terms of quality of life, air we breathe, water we drink and soil that grows our food what choice is there.

Re think our position Australia has an opportunity to lead rather than merely following less informed and short term thinkers in other countries.

Think BIG for all our sakes.

Kerri Heavens

To Whom It May Concern

As a voter and a person who cares about the planet, I am extremely disappointed with governments 5-15% target for carbon reduction. Hopes were high when Kevin Rudd became Prime Minister but this watered down target is undermining efforts to form a crucial international agreement and must be amended before December's 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.

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

New scientific findings show that the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt entirely within the next five years and this government has a responsibility to act to protect Australia for future generations.

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

Yours in hope,

Joanne Duncan

I am so frustrated. I have no power to act in climate change. In the past my family have been quietly doing our bit. Before any claims were available we installed low flow shower heads, insulation, a tank connected to the toilet, solar hot water and double glazing. Our next step is to get solar panels. All this to do our bit because the government is doing so little. I am ashamed that Australian's are the worst emmitters in the world and I am ashamed that our successive governments make any excuse under the sun to get out of taking real action.

Now I'm worried that by installing solar panels I will actually be helping our worst polluters. You've even taken away the right of small people to try and make a difference!

Is it that hard to set up solar panel factories in the Latrobe Valley so that, as coal is phased out, there are jobs for the locals.

When will Australia become a leader in this field? We have ample solar radiation and we are losing our solar experts overseas. Let's lead the world and make us all proud to be Australian again!

Katy Addis

The Government was elected on a mandate of climate control. Individuals are willing to change and to accept the financial cost of life change towards a green planet.

Climate change does seem to be occurring, especially with the loss of the Ice Bridge.

I feel that the Government has sold out on its ideas to big business. We are followers of greed and a dirty dollar.

Carbon Emissions scheme is virtually useless. The target of 5-15% is too little too late.

Hopelessness ...

Regards

Kirk

I want to see more emphasis on conserving energy, reducing our need for appliances, air-con, heating, by retrofitting energy saving measures to homes and educating people about hidden energy use (forbid stand-by for a start!).

I want to see Australia as a world leader in using solar energy and becoming independent off coal so this valuable resource, along with oil will still be available to many, many future generations and not just us!

There should be rewards for saving energy - if we reduce our need and use more efficiently what we have, then we have plenty and can supply plenty when and where it is needed. 90% of fossil energy burned is lost through heat, loss in powerlines, heating up/cooling spaces that don't get used and other wasteful practices.

I want my government to show the world an example of being REALLY environmentally friendly - not just pretend!

regards,

Suzy Gneist,

"Business as usual - Pollution as usual" is no longer sustainable nor acceptable. After showing much promise prior to the last Federal election the Government is now weakened where it comes to taking hard (and what will become even harder) decisions with regards to Carbon Targets. The paltry amount of 5-15% is insulting and will make it so much harder in the future. We have dilly-dallied on this issue for far too long. It is URGENT that proper, meaningful, sustainable targets be set as a matter of urgency.

Craig Whitford

My main point of concern with the CPRS put forward by the government is that the scheme does not apply pressure for reductions across the board and bank reductions in CO2 emissions wherever and whenever they occur. Any net any reductions which my family makes, or my neighbour makes, need to become reductions that are part of Australia's energy budget, not opportunities for industry to pollute more elsewhere.

Thank you

Annette Horsler



Dear Mr. Rudd and Ms.Wong,

I'm despondant about your plans for Climate Change. I seem to think that you are both in cahoots with the Coal Industry.What about the Solar Industry??

One of the reasons I voted for Labor was your proposed action on this very important issue which you have dramatically downgraded.

I believe that you needto set a much higher target to reduce Carbon ommissions. I am extremely worried about the future.

I am very disappointed in your response so far.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Trethowan.

Hi,

As a regular person I am disgusted at the flip flop on the climate change model proposed by the various governments.

We require decisive action to address real concerns with climate change.

It is crazy to think that a 5% reduction will do anything. You don't have to be smart to see that populations will increase, consumption of energy will increase and people will require more services.

I urge the government to become more proactive about this and get a realistic target for this reduction in carbon.

People are concerned about this, do the right thing, business will adapt.

Don McIntosh

I was hopeful with the change in Government that we could become innovative world leader's in setting brilliant standards in efficient use of our precious resources. Let's be bold and courageous and push ahead with challenging goals that help to transform the way we do business and live in this country. Let's set a new world standard so other countries can look to us as a shining example of what can be done.

Be brave - so many of us are behind you!

Amanda

As a member of the human race, I have become growingly concerned with the attitude of the governments of the world attempting to approach climate change.

Strong action is required and it will not come without the sacrifice of certain members of the global community. The stronghold of industry over the rest of the planet can no longer be acceptable.

As a small country we have the ability to show the rest of the world that we are not afraid to embrace change and can make the commitment to our world by introducing stronger reduction levels.

Our planet is ALWAYS changing and we must change with it as we continue our journey onto the next step in evolution.

Tim Bevitt

To the Greens, the Opposition and the Independents and all those involved in your inquiry into the Government's climate policy,

Please argue for strong action on this issue -- the type of strong action that is currently being undertaken in light of the state of world finances.

Please, put the issue of climate change at the top of the list of priorities. The feeling in the community is that with no world to live on, what is the use of good finances?

Myself and many others are extremely fearful of the most recent findings that climate changes (of a seemingly man made kind) are occurring at a faster rate -- just look at the break up of ice this week, and the fact that the Arctic summer sea ice will melt entirely within 5 years. (What if that is even only half accurate -- isn't that of MAJOR concern?).

I am not at all convinced by the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme as it stands. It would appear to add up to nothing. It just comes over as a theory and a political kind of 'solution'. In truth it now appears to lack integrity, even if initially there was integrity there.

Please, use your position to enforce the setting of a string target with a well-designed CPRS scheme. Personally I have no problem with governments and leaders making mistakes if they are honest ones, but this one is heading towards being a mistake that could have been avoided.

Be sure that people are absolutely sick and tired of politicians; tired and completely over the black and white approach to life. We want bi-partisan, honest action that has nothing to do with whether you win your next seat.

We want integrity. ( That's why Obama got in -- it wasn't even his policies).

Best wishes to you in your custodianship of the earth,

Brendan C Joyce, DMA

The evidence of climate change grows by the day, shelf ice melting in the Antarctic, record floods, draughts, fires and storms. Australia is vulnerable to many of the negative consequences of increased methane and CO2 levels in the worlds atmosphere.

The worlds polluters, governments and individuals must find ways of addressing this problem urgently. In-action is not an option, action must be taken now. There are too many examples in humanities history of disastrous consequences of unsustainable life styles. We cannot take the chance of inaction or inadequate action.

Australia needs to be there with the world leaders in taking innovative and effective action against causes of climate change. Too little too late is not good enough to overtake the greatest threat humanity has faced in its entire history. The governments target of 5-15% is not good enough, it needs to be raised to at least 60% by 2020 to be truly effective. Kevin Rudd presented his government as being strong on the threat of climate change. This promise must be fulfilled and also needs to support the efforts of other governments by setting a more realistic target.

Also it appears that the CPR Scheme may in effect be counter productive by indirectly rewarding polluters. The government needs to be more proactive developing innovative ways of absorbing the carbon, such as providing farmers with incentives to implement farm forestry and increasing soil carbon on their properties. Since farmers manage 65% of Australia's land mass and carbon plays an important part in their production cycle, this would have a broad range of benefits as well as addressing the carbon problem. In addition to this farmers have a role to play in the production of renewable energies such bio-fuels that grow on unproductive land such as Pongamia.

Australia's productivity needs to be refocused in a much more sustainable way. Old and new industries can play a part in carbon sequestration and renewable energy production but they need leadership and support from government. The general public has already spoken in support of a government that promised addressing climate change now it is time for the government to deliver by way of an effective policy and speedy implementation of it.

Martin Novak

To the Australian Government

We wish to express our deep concern at the weak target for action on climate change that the Australian Government is planning. The latest worrying information coming in on climate change that indicates it is far worse than thought should be motivation enough for the Government to review all policies. We need to make sure we do everything possible to support the right sort of growth in Australia for a changed future. We also need to be a strong voice on the world stage for real and ethical change, for the good of the earth and all people. We are a privileged country in so many ways and yet are showing very little generosity of spirit and leadership in our policies.

The weaknesses in the CPRS will undermine the efforts of individuals to reduce pollution and in its present form allows polluters to avoid taking real responsibility for carbon reduction. It is time for us all to be willing to invest in a long time future and bear the costs. The Government needs to believe in its own policies and have enough integrity to put country and a future first and re-election second. Everything depends on this now.

Susan Laing

To Whom It May Concern,

Myself and everyone I know find it appalling and shameful that the federal government will only commit to a 5-15% greenhouse reduction target. Australia's native species are facing extinction at a rate not seen since the first European arrivals, and this is being directly attributed to climate change. We must be committed to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. That 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% is appalling, and this must be changed.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Fisher.



I do not intend to go over the now well known design flaws in your proposed CPRS.

What really concerns me is how I tell my two beautiful little grand-daughters that I stood by and let a government that I had so much faith in, barely 14 months ago, go back on their election commitment on climate change. An horrific legacy that will affect their lives so full of potential, if we take no action NOW.

Please listen to the voices of the ordinary concerned people who were responsible for electing you, rather than the self-interested voices of the well resourced coal and aluminium lobby.

It is not too late. The fate of this planet (and my next vote!) depends on this outcome.

Peter Sansom

I am appalled by the poor response that your government is proposing in its climate change policy. It falls so far short of the minimum that is needed to save mankind and the planet from disaster that it is laughable. Worse still it is based upon exporting our problem by buying credits through stopping the clearing of forests in PNG & Indonesia. In effect you are proposing to do nothing to reduce Australian emissions. This is a moral outrage!

One can only conclude that your government is beholden to the coal lobby despite the fact that they are nothing like as important to our economy as they would have us believe and that Australia could readily replace their contribution to GNP with fully sustainable industry.

The longer we leave the vital changes the harder it will be to make them. And we will be playing catch-up when we should be leading the world.

Yours truly

Fred Herbert

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

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

Let's do more and lead the world to save the planet for our children.

Carolyn Clark

To whom it may concern,

We should be investing in future technology and stand out as pioneers in the research and development of green technology. It will create more green jobs in the future and more skilled jobs than the number of jobs we will eventually lose in the 'old' industries.

Setting 'hard' targets to achieve now will help focus industries on the future requirements and propel them towards our targets. Better now than later when it will hurt our economy more. Once industry has a focus, universities will attract more students wanting to study the required science and environmental courses to fill the jobs.

I don't understand why government is so worried about what industry is telling them when change can propel industry to new heights and that the voting public will understand when certain industries suffer because of the targets. Governments need to 'sell' the green jobs that are going to be created on the other side of the coin.

A good tax regime rewarding green industry will get it moving along very quickly and encourage outside investment funds to flow into Australia as well. This will offset the negative impact on our 'old' industries which given time will not be sustainable anyway.

Yours Sincerely,

Andrew Stigter.

Before the Labour Government came to power the Australian people were persuaded that Labour's climate change targets would be more 'environmentally friendly' than that of the Howard government's.

I realise that it's a difficult balancing act to get it right, but lowering the target to appease business won't matter much when we're all up to our ears in sea water!

Here's hoping you are acting in the best interests of the people of Australia and the world. If he's really fair dinkum, I'd like mr Rudd to show the same type of leadership that he displayed at the G20 on this issue.

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

Regards,

Chris Lotinga

Please look at scientific findings. We need to commit to 50% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020.

The CPRS needs redesigning so that it does not over compensate p[olluters at the expense of community and environment.

Lesly Howard

Research has shown time and time again that 5 - 15% target to a reduction in greenhouse pollution is NOT ENOUGH!!!! This Governmnet should make a stand and take the lead and show how serious and conscious they are about looking after our earth.

Climate change is happening faster than first predicted; the announced weak target of 5-15% is undermining efforts with international potential agreements - need to improve to take to the UN conference in Copenhagen.

I dont agree with the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme - the community and environment ends up losing out due to the scheme over compensates for larger polluters, thus is badly designed. It is the large businesses and industry bodies that can take advantage of energy reductions made by individuals and small businesses, which will only make room for these larger bodies (large polluters) to increase their emissions under the proposed emissions cap. The target needs to be alot more in order for it to take effect on all emissions producers, including the worsed polluters (large industry bodies).

Australia has the opportunity to take a lead in climate change, particularly in renewable energy industries and it can do this by setting strong greenhouse pollution reduction targets with a well designed scheme.

Currently, the CPRS and the greenshouse reduction target is pathetic and almost produced with fear - GO ON....dare to be strong and couragous .....take a stance.... at least make it look like you CARE for the EARTH you live on and make realistic agreements and stick to them!!!

Thanks for your time - hope it was worth it

Jo North

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

Vivian Baruch.



We need to make more urgent action on Greenhouse and other pollution prevention and resource depletion areas. This requires targets that we can meet in Greenhouse emissions and water consumption and other biological resources. I believe that at the least our Greenhouse emissions should be targeted at a reduction of 50% by 2020. This can easily be achieved by community action, it does not require the development of new "clean" energy technologies. What we need is leadership from the government and the denial of vested interests in the status quo.

John Cumming

Australia should be working ahead of, if not alongside, other countries towards ensuring we are making sound, well-informed decisions regarding our schemes to reduce the effects of climate changes.

Our CPRS should be designed to be effective, not just appease those governing money.

The speed of our decisions should match those of the rapid changes being evidenced in areas such as the Arctic.

Sincerely,

Ms L Megaloconomos

Take up for solar generating is so high the govt has ended up changing the rebate to reduce demand. Victoria has a limit on the power they buy from these systems - why? Use emission targets as the basis to develop new industries (ie jobs)and strategies. Make the GFC an opportunity to reduce green house emissions rather than a burden.

Australians are very inventive especially under pressure and a declining economy can be used as a powerfull rallying point.

I urge the Rudd Govt to be more courageous, bit the bullet and innovate - increase the govts green house emissions targets.

Leanne Guy

I am writing to express my disappointment in the government's weak target for greenhouse gas reduction of 5-15% by the year 2020 under 1990 levels. This figure is not ambitious enough if we are to avoid dangerous climate change - we need a target more in the 40-50% range by 2020.

I understand there is a problem with Australia "going it alone", but we need to set our aspirations high if we are to help lead the world to meaningful reductions in greenhouse gases.

I am also disappointed that the government has given so much ground to polluting industries such as coal fired power, aluminum and cement. While the level of compensation described in the Green paper may have been fair, more recent capitulations to these industries have led to over-compensation to the extent that incentives to reduce emissions are very weak.

I urge the government to reconsider these issues.

Sincerely,

Hamish Meffin.

:

To Kevin Rudd.

The dramatic evidence from the Antarctic , with the breaking away of the massive ice shelf, clearly demonstrates that global warming and climate change is accelerating .

I believe that the Australian Government should take the lead and set higher carbon pollution reduction targets.

The current 5-15% target is not enough! The Australian Government's target should be at least a 50% reduction by 2020.

As a concerned Australian citizen, I demand strong action by my elected Government representatives, especially when attending the UN Conference on Climate Change, this coming December, in Copenhagen. Lead the world and force the other nations to follow by setting a 50% reduction target.

Thank you.

Chris Jones

As a private citizen I am going to considerable expense to limit my drain on the resources of this country. I feel that all my efforts are in vain when large polluters are only minimally discouraged from polluting. At the same time these environmental vandals using up carbon resources, when they could be using renewable energy.

Jocelyn Geraghty

The tides occur on a regular basis and can be harnessed to generate electricity.

The sun shines every day and its energy can be converted into heat and electricity, the excess of which can be stored in a variety of ways for use in non-daylight hours.

Wind energy is proven technology but is under utilised in Australia.

What is needed is a full commitment from all our politicians to 'bite the bullet' of costs and implement ALL OF THESE SOLUTIONS immediately to save our planet.

Ray O'Brien

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in response to the extremely poor efforts by the Australian government to take responsibility for Australia's part in avoiding a global catastrophe.

The most accurate and unbiased climate science to date shows that global emissions reductions of at least 80% are required by 2050 (based on 1990 levels) if temperature rises are maintained below 2-2.5 degrees C. Further predictions show that to achieve this on a global scale our emissions must peak by 2015.

Despite this being 6 years away, global emissions are still rising by 3% each year and will experience further exponential growth if individuals, organisations and governments do not make decisive and disruptive commitments towards sustainability, rather than incrementally becoming less unsustainable.

Australia is in a far better position than most countries to make this commitment yet the current target lags well behind most industrialised nations and shows that our government is clearly not taking this threat seriously.

Global cuts of 80% by 2050 mean Australia should be achieving at least 50% reductions by 2020. Every day wasted with these ineffectual targets is a lost opportunity to avert serious global problems and a lost opportunity for Australia to take advantage of and lead these new industries.

Kind Regards,

Hannah Morton



It seems extraordinary that the world leaders can quickly rally together when there is a monetary problem, whereas when the earth faces disaster due to climate change and rising sea levels, all governments do is aim to reduce greenhouse gases by an amount which is only a fraction of what the climate change scientists say are necessary.

It seems ridiculous that under the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme if private individuals take measures to reduce their greenhouse emissions, eg installing solar panels, then the cost to the large polluter is reduced.

Margaret Baber

Like many Australians the government's greenhouse polition target is way too low. I realise setting it higher will have a negative short term effect on Australian industry and business. But we must take a long term view - for our children and our grand children's sake. I am also unimpressed with the Carbon Reduction Scheme. It appears to have serious flaws and may indeed have the opposite effect to the one intended - a lot of wasted money on adminstration costs that we can ill afford. I urge the enquiry to review the current government proposal. To get it wrong now will be disastrous. To simply sit by and do little because we're still waiting on others to respond is no excuse and not the sort of international leadership we expect from our current government. Give us more than shimmer and floss!

Robert Sterry

Dear sir/madam

I acknowledge that balancing our countries wealth, prosperity and GDP in an ecologically sustainable manner is difficult. However the previous centuries ignorance of the environment and tunnel vision for productivity must now change.

You have a responsibility to preserve the environment for future generations and develop policy that is 'truly' long term. Small job loss or loss of productivity may be suffered but this should be minimised by funding and emphasis on alternative energy sources.

Yours sincerely

Josh Crosbie

Hi government members,

I appreciate that you're busy with all the other things that governments need to consider but I URGE you to consider more than 5%. The environmental statistics constantly expounded in magazines like the New Scientist implies that changes must be made and they need to be done VERY soon. For the sake of our children, we must increase the target percentage - 20% is the minimum suggested and we've only achieved 1/4 of that!!! Lead the way, do what's needed and be remembered as a pioneering government for future generations to learn from.

Laura Galley (Rockhampton)

Weak targets help no-one.

The Australian people need strong leadership in tackling climate change. The government must revise its pollution targets to 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

This action must be taken now. There will be no second chance. Kevin Rudd was given a mandate to strongly lead Australia into a low-carbon world. He must think beyond the short-term electoral and financial cycles and put Australia on-track for the future.

Dr Bronwyn Walker

We need a better designed scheme for reducing carbon pollution. Now that the U.S. President has set the tone for improved response to climate change, we should review our efforts as well.

Geraldine Moore

Australia is now in a position where it has very little capacity to produce renewable technology.

It is about time that the Rudd Government took some real and substantial initiatives to rectify this situation.

It is commendable that funding has been provided for a pilot small industrial scale production line based upon the University of NSW PV technology. It is also commendable that funds have been provided for a concentrated thermal solar collector to be built by ANU and Wizard Power and other research aimed towards commercialization.

The Governments funding of Spark Solar and the ANU for research, in conjunction with Braggone OY, a Finnish company, on nanoparticle plasmonics, may lead to PV cost becoming substantially less expensive.

The free market has failed the world financial system. We can no longer rely upon the free market to effectively address Climate Change and Peak Oil.

Australian's need to see a Government that is prepared to get behind local PV and concentrating thermal solar industries.

Australia needs strong GHG targets; targets it is prepared to work towards by very actively fostering and using a new renewable energy industrial base.

An AUSTRALIAN RENEWABLE ENERGY FUND of say \$5 billion over five years is probably as important or more important than the broadband initiative.

Howard Patrick

Dear Mr. Rudd

I am so concerned by the escalating problems on climate and the apparant lack lustre reaction of govrn. If you put the energy into rectifying the problems of climate, you and the 'world leaders' are putting into the economic crisis we'd just be fine. I could'nt believe it when I heard the 5% target you think is fine. It is suggested that a 50% reduction by 2020 would closer to what really is required.

The Australian people deserve better.

Yesterday's news about the escalation melt down in Antartica sent shivers up my spine, how did your's feel?

Set a strong target, trust the experts you have, because if you don't it will be a very different country that we live in and not one that my children want to bring children into.

Take care,

Marion Cassell



As a mother of two young children, I am deeply concerned about the rapid rate of climate change.

The Government's target of 5-15% is not good enough. I thought the Rudd government was truly going to tackle climate change, be a world leader in renewable energy and have the strength to stand up to the big polluters.

The proposed CPRS does not make sense to me! Why would we as individuals bother to spend extra money trying to do the right thing by the environment, when any effort and expense on our part to reduce greenhouse emissions will only allow the big polluters to increase their emissions under the CPRS.

A higher target and a better designed scheme is urgently needed in order to have any chance of tackling climate change before it is too late.

I look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

Simone Mitchell-Nolan

The Governments emission targets are completely inadequate to combat climate change. The government must take a much stronger approach emissions target as recommended by scientist (50% 1990 levels by 2020). In Penny Wong's words, "the governments policy will achieve a lot more than any INDIVIDUAL could do"(!), essentially admits that the policy achieves next to nothing. With the Great Barrier Reef dying, flooding in Queensland, fires in Victoria and drought everywhere, it is staggering that the government fails to see that action is required immediately! This is an opportunity for Australia to become a global leader in climate change, especially in the areas of solar power. Please, please, please use it before it is too late. For the sake of our children.

Torsten Lehmann

The government shows an almost complete disregard to the health of earth by its weak stance on global warming.

With ices shelves rapidly disappearing, what further proof does it need to know there is a dire problem? Hello: melting = warming.

The PM and Minsters Garrett and Wong are simply pandering to the fossil fuel industry by their inaction.

I strongly urge this government to honour its pre-election commitments with regard to climate change.

Saying that our action counts for little is simply a cop-out. Set the example and others will follow.

Dr. Greg Smith

The CPRS currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme. It will do more harm than good. It over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

The Government's 5-15% target is woefully inadequate in our effort to avoid dangerous climate change. Climate change is happening much faster than previously thought. Therefore we should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

Regards,

Victoria McCarthy

To whom it may concern

The current Australian government was elected on a promise that they would make a significant positive change to environmental policy.

I do not believe the policy put forward is strong enough.

In the time the parties have been debating this policy our country has seen numerous environmental disasters on a scale rarely seen before, all condensed into a few short months, and all repeated numerous times within this period.

We are also seeing Antarctica melt at an unprecedented pace, not to mention the fact that there basically is no Arctic at all anymore. And let's not forget that species within the world's ecosystem are quietly becoming increasingly extinct.

Through the current world financial situation governments of the world have been given the power to force the big business polluters to change their ways and yet the current policy subsidises their activity and ensures they will have the means to continue their current systems with only minor restrictions until 2020.

How can that possibly be found to be the correct course of action? If one looks back at the environmental and climatic changes within only the last ten years, can we really afford to continue being so complacent for another ten?

We elected a government to make a difference, not excuses. It seems to me Penny Wong is only in the position she is in because she has a remarkable ability to never actually answer any of the important questions. From her statements it is clear she has no interest in making a change, but a strong interest in protecting the large companies from having to even consider making changes until at least 2020. Why?

They have been reaping the rewards for countless years now, isn't it time someone forced them to reinvest some of their profit to bring the industry into line with safe and sustainable practices?

It is possible to use this situation to improve the country's systems. Open the competition up to new ideas and new designs and yet we are protecting the dinosaur attitudes that built us into this situation in the first place. We are trying to ensure their success in their current model until 2020...Why? What do we owe them? Big business NEVER does the public any favours, why should the government provide this favour to them (on our, unrequested or supported behalf).

NOT GOOD ENOUGH PENNY

YOUR LOYALTY IS TO THE COUNTRY, NOT TO THE INDUSTRY

STOP TRYING TO STIFLE OUR OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

START RECOGNISING THE PROMISE THAT PUT YOU INTO POWER

THE TIME FOR POLITICAL AGENDA ON THIS ISSUE IS OVER

ITS TIME TO MAKE A (SIGNIFICANT) CHANGE

Increasingly concerned citizen.

Jared Lewis

Dear Future Maker,

I am writing to express my concern over the Rudd government's emissions reduction target of 5 - 15%. I strongly feel that these targets are way too low to have any impact on the clear and present threat of climate change (that is happening NOW).

The government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Policy gives far too much concession to the nation's biggest polluters, those that should be getting the greatest push to clean up the way they do business.

We are at a critical point in our national and global history, where definitive action to change our habits and ways of manufacturing, creating and living, can literally make or break our future. But industry must be held equally accountable - OR MORE SO - than the households and communities that are making efforts to reduce their carbon footprints.

I urge you, as a concerned citizen and voter, to please represent my concerns in parliament.

Yours, in hope,

Julie Morandini

Dear Ms Wong

The Labor Govt's Climate Policy and mooted cut to emissions of 5% of 2000 levels is completely inadequate. The policy further seeks to protect and reward (with free permits) the rent seekers and vested interests, many of which make generous political donations to the Labor party.

The disingenuous nature of this policy and the spin put on it leads me to despair for this country's democracy let alone the disasterous future of mega fires, constant drought and extreme cyclones and storms your government is locking in for our children and grandchildren.

The Financial Crisis gives us a wonderful opportunity to retool our country's manufacturing sector with new renewable technologies and projects, all of which could be paid for with the cessation of subsidies to the existing extractive industries and the inevitable phasing out of coal exportation (it will be forced on us in coming years by the rest of the world anyway). Why not start implementing an orderly transision for the working families you claim to care so much about, and get fair dinkum about a target, 50% reduction to emissions on 1990 levels by 2020 (some of us haven't forgotten Kyoto you know).

Michelle Wellard

The Government's current climate change target is not sufficient if we are to bring about real reductions in emissions over the coming few years. With further evidence emerging this week about disintegration in Antarctic ice sheets well before their predicted demise, it's time that we admit the impacts of climate change are far more advanced than previously thought. Who knows when we will reach crucial tipping points, but we do not want to find ourselves in a position where we look back and say we should have done more earlier. The time is now. We need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

As a wealthy nation, Australia can afford to take a lead on climate change. As always, actions will speak louder than words. If we expect other countries to embark on their own emission cutting paths the least we can do is set a worthy example. If we start now we may well be able to export our emission cutting expertise to the world and create sustainable jobs that benefit the economy and the environment now and in the future. The current economic climate is providing ample opportunities for a paradigm shift. It's time to do things differently to create a sustainable future for current and future generations of Australians.

To avoid some of the disastrous consequences of climate change we need to act now, for the costs of waiting will be great. Not only should the target be stronger but the generous concessions to business should be rethought, and funds generated by the sale of carbon permits should be reinvested to fund further mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as ensuring that sufficient funds are used to support neighbouring and other developing countries that will be hardest hit by significant sea rises.

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

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

Regards

Kathryn



I'm extremely disappointed at the apparently weak targets set. We need strong targets based on the science already available to us that shows that such small targets will not be enough.

Further more I'm extremely concerned that efforts by the community to reduce our emission will not change the overall emissions as big polluters can do less. The community is way ahead in it's readiness to bite the bullet. I will go ahead with my purchase of solar panels and continue to make changes to reduce our families emissions because it is the right thing to do. CPRS policy should support community efforts.

Of course green technology when fiully embraced will be good for the economy.

Yours truly

Carolyn Layton

I believe the people of Australia (and therefore our Government) have a responsibility to show leadership on the issue of climate change and energy usage. As one of the leading polluters on a per capita basis we must make drastic and meaningful cuts to our carbon emissions and energy usage. Sure - due to our small population, our total effect on the global environment can be considered to be small, but if every country thought like that and polluted the world to the same level of Australia then we would surely see dramatic and unstoppable change to the world and environment we live in.

Australia has the means and I believe the will of the people to take a position of leadership in the this issue. There is undeniable evidence that the global environment is facing major change, be it man-made or natural cycles, we all need to pull together to achieve a better world for us and for all the future generations to come. Our current economic system is un-sustainable and it is inevitable that we face major change in energy use in the coming decades. If we delay making the big changes (reduced energy usage and carbon emissions) it will only oost us (as a country) and the global environment and economy in the long run. Its time for our politicians to take off the blinkers and think in the long term (ie. 50-100-500 years) rather than simply where their next vote is coming from.

Please make Australia a leader, rather than tagging only at the rear of the global environmental movement.

Thanks,

Paul Youngs

Australian government,

As a representation of your people it is imperative that tougher action is taken on climate change.  
THIS IS A HUMAN SECURITY ISSUE. Please respond accordingly.

regards

Astrid Hawke

Australia has the opportunity to be a world leader in the the fight against climate change, it's time we took greater responsibility for the problem that we have helped to create in the world. I understand that at the rate we are going we are not moving fast enough to combat the change. For the sake of Australia's future and that of the world, please look to take stronger action, especially with regards to the following

- committing to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Setting a strong target with 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.;

- Changing your Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) which currently is a badly designed scheme that will be do more harm than good, as it over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

Natasha Tay

Hello,

I believe the mandatory target of 5% is laughable given the urgency of the actions required, and the severity of the consequences of rampant carbon pollution globally.

People everywhere are making a difference individually, as well as many organisations, both private and public. And then there are those who are undermining these efforts. All the time purporting to be working for the common good, under the guise of elected officials. Really they are controlled by the big polluters. It is sad to see.

I have personally just completed a new house with a 5.5 star energy rating, and am in the process of installing a 1KV PV system to feed clean energy into the grid. I am appalled to think my efforts to reduce carbon emissions will come to nothing given the government's policy of passing these savings on to big business.

Get your act together now before it is too late.

Sincerely, Drew Nichols

I am most disappointed at the Government's target for CO2 reduction of 5-15%. As a developed country whose emissions per person are among the highest in the world we need to commit to much stronger targets. I also object strongly to the fact that money I have invested in solar panels in order to reduce my carbon foot-print can apparently result in a reduced requirement for industry to cut their emissions. Australia must be willing to make substantial cuts (a reduction by 2020 of at least 25% from 1990 levels) in order to do our part in avoiding the dangerous consequences of antropogenic climate change. A target of >25% would also allow us to apply more pressure on other countries to reduce their emissions.

Personally, I believe that a carbon tax is a more effective way of encouraging emission reductions than the proposed cap-and-trade scheme. If carbon dioxide emissions are taxed then we all then pay directly for the pollution we cause and are more likely to act to minimise that tax, by reducing energy use, as we do other forms of taxation.

A well-designed scheme should include incentives to refocus our economy away from coal mining and towards industries associated with renewable energy so that we are well placed to face the 21st century with a manufacturing industry based on 21st century technology and 21st century needs.

Bruce Johnson

Dear political leaders

Like many Australians I was shocked and disappointed at the government's 5% target for carbon emission reduction.

Like many others I am willing to support dramatic measures to change our nation's use of carbon emitting products. Government must lead and industry must be persuaded to come along willingly. Our economy, including big business and private households, must be refocused around environmentally sustainable action.

Every time I hear or read scientific opinion on the matter of climate change there is more certainty about the rate of change and the urgent need for us all to act.

Please take action to make Australia a world leader in action on climate change.

Best wishes

Barbara Baird,

I want the actions that I take to reduce my emissions to not enable big business to increase theirs. Increase your reduction target, so that the businesses that make the most pollution have to pay the most- it makes sense.

Think of how ashamed you'll be when your grandchildren ask you why you didn't have more guts. This is not just a political issue, it is a moral, ethical and social one. WHO CARES WHAT THE REST OF THE WORLD IS DOING- SHOW SOME LEADERSHIP please!

As the old saying goes, no jobs on a dead planet.

Susanne Prosser



Just a few thoughts....

Let's stop pfafling around with 5-15% targets and get strong on leading the way back to planetary health. Set the target that will stimulate the responses that current science tells us is needed. Tell the UN Conference to be held in Denmark in December that Australia will reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels. The average Oze doesn't want polluters to prosper, especially at our expense under the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS). If polluters can't clean up their processes and change to renewable energy sources; then make way for new operators who can. Oze's don't want weak targets; they want to get on with renewable energy generation that is not linked to coal or uranium. Help put the average Oze and the big polluters in a position to generate renewable energy (solar, wind, wave, etc.)and contribute to the grid. Let's be smart, innovative and inventive (all our strong suits), rather than shying away from a real problem.

Regards, Vanessa Parle.

Please commit to an adequate carbon emissions cut - at least 50% by 2020. Anything less than this is simply not a serious approach to this issue - please don't insult the Australian and world population with target cuts such as 5%.

Regards,

Brad

Dear Kevin Rudd

The science is clear, we are beyond debating: it's time for real action on climate change. Make your economic aid in this economic crisis preferential for low carbon industries. Invest in Biochar programs, renewable energy, energy efficiency programs, electric cars and promote the use of public transport. The science is clear and the technology exists to solve the problem, they just need investment. Hard decisions that don't favour traditional energy, automobile and oil companies are called for, please increase the emissions reduction target to 50% by 2020.

Best Regards

Cameron Cope

Please revisit the Government's proposed scheme.

Let's make Australia a country to be proud of and give the scheme powers to make a difference.

It not a revenue raising exercise where gross polluters do a little offsetting and bookwork rejugging.  
It is about ethically making a difference and reducing emissions.

Goodluck.

Let us find a few good men who can bring this cause to a healthy resolution.

Debbie Craven

The recent shattering evidence of climate change coming out of Antarctica, should make it blindingly obvious to the most ardent sceptics that our world is in serious danger of self destructing.

Australia needs to show it is genuine and match the rhetoric to action.

The 5-15% reduction of green house pollution proposed is pathetic, a more realistic target by 2020 (on 1990 levels) would be 40-50%. This is not a good example to be taking to Copenhagen - we will be marginalised by the significant players.

I strongly object to the current CPRS proposal which so over compensates the major polluters that the efforts (overtly encouraged) of the general community are completely nullified!

The current CPRS proposal also discourages new green innovations & initiatives and sends the creators and developers off shore where their clever endeavors are appreciate We have such a long history of this. I had actually believed the Rudd government would have been more visionary in this regard.

Sincerely Lynne Davis

I urge the government to raise the green house reduction target as an imperative for tackling climate change. With the recent loss of the Antarctic shelf and the meltin of the Artic summer ice, Australia needs to take action that is a serious attempt to address global warming rather than play at token gestures. The current 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements 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 over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. At the same time there appears to have been no attempt to address myriad emissions resulting from the design of government programs that are contracted into the private and non-government sectors. We cannot ignore the contribution to emissions made by all sectors of the economy. Contracts need to include carbon reduction clauses and programs redesigned to be delivered at lower emission levels. The 'big' polluters need to be put on notice that profiting from emissions is no longer acceptable. They have had many years now to adjust their industries and associated technology; and must cease to drive us further into the warming scenario.

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.

Dr Jennifer Lehmann

I am very disappointed in the government's announced Climate Policy. Before the elections I believed that a Labor Government would take the world situation seriously and introduce a meaningful target for our greenhouse pollution. Experts seem to cite 50% by 2020 as the figure that is essential if we are to make a meaningful difference.

I would have thought that the government that stood on a strong green platform would have a target closer to this figure and one that would be more directed towards the big polluters. I understand that the economy has made being too draconian towards the business community difficult, but to introduce a policy that is regarded by many experts as almost counter-productive is weak and irresponsible. I would like to register my strong disappointment and request that you rethink this policy for the benefit of the world and our nation. For too long, under the Howard government, we have been dragging the chain on investing in clean green technologies. Technologies which will set us as world leaders and not laggard--technologies which will benefit our economy. Even some industries are requesting the government to legislate so that they are not disadvantaged by following an environmentally responsible path.

Please reconsider your position on this issue.

Marti Marosszeky

Climate change may be unavoidable, but we human beings should endeavour to make life bearable for as long as possible. Australians cannot expect the rest of the world to set an example worth emulating, so should think and promptly act in a manner which will help to reduce the problem. This probably means reducing our standard of living, but the matter demands greater urgency than any other problem facing our Government today!

Philip and Sally Brentnall



Hello,

I am very concerned about the Government's substandard approach to cutting greenhouse gas emissions. We should be committing to reducing our greenhouse gases by 50% on 1990 levels by 2020 in order to have a real effect on climate change. The Government's 5 to 15% proposal will not provide adequate change.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme effectively proposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall. This is bad policy and will not effectively reduce our emissions.

Regards,

Margaret

I am disappointed in the low target the current government has set for greenhouse reductions on behalf of the Australian people. I had hoped for much better from this government in terms of planning for our future in this country and on the planet. I wish to add my voice to those calling for at least 25% in the short term, and a target of 50% by 2020.

I believe the Carbon Pollution Reduction scheme proposed by this government is seriously flawed. The scheme will reward major polluters rather than those who have structured their businesses so as to have minimum impact on the environment from the start. Big business which contributes to the continued pollution of our environment should be punished. They shouldn't have to be paid to stop!!

It is time for you to get serious about the problem, rather than paying lip service to reducing carbon pollution, while in reality setting targets that ultimately allow big industry to increase their emissions.

It is not too late to rethink this shortsighted and timid approach, and develop a plan which will really help us. I implore you to stand up for the future wellbeing of the people who elected you!

Regards, Jane Elliott

Dear Senators,

With monumental impending change likely my biggest concern is for the enormity of ignorance in media and social debate. Essentially we face harder tougher times and psychologically we are very naive as a collective civilization. I think and feel a call back to self-reliance and personal responsibility is essential for our future.

The greatest achievement we can make to the Earth is to re-connect respectfully, morally and holistically. Einstein said that we can't solve the problems of today with the same thoughts that created them. Think holistically and we will act holistically, however to be holistic is to be personally responsible for everything. This freedom is a wonderful maturity.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak and do your very best with limited time and much debate.

Jonathan Cassell

Now is such a good time to invest in renewable energy and to start to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, especially coal for electricity. We know the climate is changing and events such as the recent bush fires in Victoria and the floods up and down the coast of Queensland will probably continue with associated loss of life, of homes, of livestock, of native animals and the beautiful bush of Australia.

I am concerned that the current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Labor Government is badly designed and doesn't do enough. I am convinced that the public are looking for leadership on this and if well informed, will support efforts to reduce carbon pollution.

I am not convinced that the Carbon Trading Scheme is the best way to go and want some research or inquiry to compare the outcomes of this scheme and that of a carbon tax that would be applied to all sources of carbon including cars, trucks etc. We need to be mindful of the carbon dioxide produced as a result of our actions and decision and start reducing it.

I want to be able to make decisions about the actions i take to reduce my contribution to Australia's green house gasses and avoid extra costs associated with the impact of climate change and carbon emissions.

Sally Jope

To Kevan and Penny

Come on get real, it won't matter about the financial cost if there is no planet that we can live on.

I want a 25% target and I am happy to pay.

regards

Cathy Birchall

PS and I will vote against you if you do not produce a stronger response to global warming.

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

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

This is the single most important issue facing us today and we cannot fail future generations because of lack of will and strength today.

Jo-Anne Dwyer

To who it may concern,

I'm writing to express serious concerns about the government's climate change policy. I voted for the Labour government because they promised stronger action on climate change, but have been disappointed because it's been over a year and nothing significant has been done.

The 5-15% target is not strong enough. Climate change is happening faster than was first thought so strong, clear action is needed now. We have a small window of opportunity to do something about this, but it's closing fast.

Our weak targets are sending a weak message to the rest of the world. The developed world contributed to and benefitted from current emissions levels the most, therefore it is our responsibility to set an example. It is the inverse law of climate change that those who contributed the least to the problem will suffer that most and that's just no fair.

The CPRS is a badly designed, weak scheme that will do more harm than good. It over compensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment.

We need to set an example by setting strong targets through a well designed scheme. This will not only show that Australia is doing its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change but it will help us refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

We need to be leaders on this issue not followers.

Seona Candy

In light of climate research from around the globe the Government's 5-15% target is dangerously inadequate. The latest NASA research for example, which finds the Arctic ice during summer is expected to melt entirely within the next five or so year. We need to commit to stronger targets. Reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 on 1990 levels is not unreasonable.

It was bad enough under the Howard government, where he would not ratify kyoto while the rest of the world looked on. It's weak leadership on these important internationally issues which make me embarrassed to be Australian. December's UN Conference on Climate Change provides a real opportunity for Australia to show leadership and compassion and to renew our standing on climate change issues.

Currently it appears as though the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is in need of much improvement, as in it's current form it is likely to do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target (50%) with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia is a good global citizen and does its fair share to minimise the ever-increasing negative effects of climate change.

Australia also has a huge opportunity to be a world leader in renewable energy. Griffith University, for example this year launched a sustainable and renewable energies degree so there will be a lot of talent emerging in this field. If the government doesn't capitalise on this opportunity we are likely to lose our skilled professionals in this area overseas. It would be wise for Australia to become a leader in this sustainable industry.

Please think wisely on this important issue.

Warm regards,

Fiona



All evidence points to the need for drastic action to halt climate change.

Please act now.

Thank you.

Vianney Hatton

Dear Mr Rudd,

Climate change is something where our dynamic new government can lead the way for the rest of the world. Please take stronger action - a pitiful target of 5-15% is a drop in the rapidly rising ocean, and will not save destructive, carbon-producing jobs.

Our children need a world to live in, and the way we're going, there won't be one.

Jocelyn Dyte

To whom it may concern,

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Piers Twomey

Regarding climate change and carbon pollution reduction Australia needs a high priority national plan to support all Australian teams working on research and development of renewable energy and to set up the financial framework to ensure the commercial implementation of successful research. Current Government support is inadequate given the calamitous effects of climate change.

Brian Edgar

To whom it may concern,

I am conerned. I am very concerned that the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should be leading the way. Creating an opportunity for Australian businesses to lead the world in developing renewable energy and energy efficient technologies. We need to create incentive for such business ventures. How about we commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by say 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels)?

I am also 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.

Under the scheme, it seems that the only way to reduce Australia's environmental impact beyond the cap, is to buy permits and 'rip them up'!!! How completely ridiculous!!! No stakeholder or community would see this as an effective way to make additional 'voluntary reductions'.

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

Regards

Rob Proctor

Help the environment as well as the economy by developing a green society .

Scientists repeatedly tell us that a 5-15% carbon reduction is not enough to prevent dangerous climate change.

Using peoples carbon credits to offset the big polluters emissions is not OK . It's hiding the true extent of the problem and robbing the people of the sense that they are making a difference .  
"There is nothing so powerful as an idea whose time has come", I urge to tap into that.

It is great that you're planning to help Asian countries to retain their forests , but this should not be considered cutting Australian emissions.

Inspire us Mr Rudd

Yours Sincerely ,

Lesley Vuilleremin

Hello,

This year, I am spending a large proportion of my savings from a part-time job, and my anticipated tax return, on installing a solar power system on my house. This is something I have long wanted to do, to make my own substantial contribution to ameliorate climate change, beyond just using less power and installing green light globes.

I have applied for and had approved the Government's solar panel rebate. But since paying my substantial deposit to an Australian solar power installer, I have noticed an increasing amount of debate informing me that any moves individuals or businesses make to offset their own energy usage with solar panels will contribute nothing to reducing carbon emissions, because of the floor beyond which carbon emissions cannot fall. And, that indeed, my efforts to reduce my carbon emissions only makes more room for polluters to up their own emissions. What then is the point!!

If we want to stimulate the economy, and renewable energy is a sector which can and should only grow, it seems ludicrous that investing in a solar power unit, and supporting local green businesses and manufacturers, will in fact achieve nothing, except maybe provide the purchaser with a sense of failure and wasted effort - and money.

Please do something to ensure a more useful target is set, so hard-working but aware individuals willing to invest in green businesses and products (and stimulate the economy) won't have to feel they have achieved nothing, and made no difference to greenhouse emissions, but rather, handed polluters an extra window to fill up with their emissions.

Thankyou,

Dr. Jennifer Mitchell

The Government must take stronger action against climate change, why cant we be leaders. Why not a 50% reduction by 2020 ?????

If anyone can do it KEVIN, you can.

Yours Sincerely

Carole Waterman



You'll get several thousand versions of GetUp's main points to raise, but I've just got one question...

What will you say to your children when the climate has changed radically and life on this large distant island has become very uncomfortable, perhaps even precariously tenuous?

"Well son/daughter, it just wasn't politically expedient to act in time, so we just made it look like we were doing something and crossed our fingers and hoped that things weren't going to get this bad"?

This is THE challenge for our civilization - it makes economic woes and broadband plans look like a child's game of Monopoly. We - that's you and me - need to ACT NOW, not prevaricate and procrastinate.

So take a stand! I'm with you.

Silas Taylor

Dear Mr Rudd

I am deeply concerned that not enough is being done to address climate change now. The targets you have set are inadequate. We must be striving towards a reduction of greenhouse gases to at least 50% by 2020. An essential part of the tools to reduce emissions must include the immediate stopping of logging of our native forests. The worlds native forests are the lungs of the planet. They soak up carbon. Deforestation is the third largest emitter of greenhouse gases. By stopping logging we reduce our emissions and capitalise on the greatest carbon sequestration tool provided by nature. A reduction of 50% of greenhouse pollution by 2020 is possible, please ensure that this tool is part of the international agreements decided upon in Copenhagen this year.

My future, and the future of the next generations and the planet - is in your hands.

Claire

As a mother with 2 young children, I am concerned that the proposed CPRS does not do enough to ensure my children's future. The CPRS over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and our environment. Setting a minimum emissions level and a low 5-15% target does not encourage small businesses or individuals to reduce our total greenhouse emissions.

I don't recall the exact words of an Indian saying I've heard but it roughly goes, "will people learn only when the last fish and food-crop have been eaten or poisoned, that we cannot eat and drink money."

I hope this government will do what's right for our future generations.

Sincerely,

Joanne van Ravenswaaij

To whom it may concern,

I wish to add my voice to the plea for more action on climate change. In the news last night I watched yet another report on how the polar ice caps are melting faster than anyone anticipated, and how, as a consequence another massive chunk of the ice shelf has broken off and floated away. The circumstances are changing even as the policies are being written.

Many people are so frustrated with the Government's weak response to climate change that they feel obligated to take the lead personally, which is back to front. The Government should be taking the lead, as it has done with campaigns against skin cancer, smoking, alcohol and obesity. We desperately need action at grass roots levels to get this campaign moving. 5-15 % carbon reduction is just not going to cut it. And the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme seems to be badly designed, which only holds back an effective response even longer. We don't have the time.

The one glimmer of hope is the new Obama administration. Please, work closely with the Americans, but don't constrain yourself your lack-lustre 5-15% target. Strive for leadership on this issue. Obtain an ambitious, unified agreement, and MAKE UP FOR LOST TIME. Get some effective policies in place and get traction on this issue.

Regards,

Matthew Dunstone

(02

Dear Sir /Madam,

I want to stress that we need to upgrade the carbon pollution Scheme by a much higher percentage to help our earth with climate change and reduce the extreme weather conditions scientifically proven being caused by emissions far to high.

Please consider our future Generations and let me be the voice for all living things on earth to plead with our government that we voted for in confidents, to do the right thing on this so important matter.

Yours sincerely Ursula Wasmund

And Dean Charles Meredith

Commit to reducing Australia's Green House pollution by 50% by 2020.

The Govt's. CPRS is badly designed and will do more harm than Good. Mag Rooney

I am concerned by the governments lack of firm and decisive action towards tackling climate change. The 5% target is unlikely to make a significant difference and sends the message to industry and the rest of the world that we are really only interested in business as usual. I believe big industries have unduly swayed the government towards weaker targets and compensation that will fail to deliver on the need to change the way we do things and coexist with the planet.

I am also dismayed as to the logic of issuing more RECS to homeowners who install solar hot water or PV setups than they will actually produce. It only dilutes the value of the RECS and allows other polluters to continue on as they have in the past. All sectors of society should make an effort and the efforts of one area should not be allowed to offset another.

Regards

Nigel Ransom

To whom it may concern,

I write to you to express my concern about the inadequate targets set forth by the Australian government for the upcoming UN climate summit in Copenhagen.

The verdict has been clear for some time now that the effects of climate change will be absolutely devastating to all citizens and beings of this great planet of ours unless something is done NOW. The 5-15% target is quite simply a farce which will do nothing but undermine the significance of the Conference in December.

The Australian government proclaims to be a world leader in policy development and says that it is at the cutting edge of scientific research.

If this is the case, which I firmly believe it to be, our poor targets will set a frightening precedent which could have dire consequences for the future of our global community.

Please, I implore you to have the courage to make the decision I truly believe you feel to be correct. Have the courage to leave behind those not willing to lead our global community into the future it wants and deserves

Thankyou,

Michael Crowe



To whom it may concern

The current Australian government was elected on a promise that they would make a significant positive change to environmental policy.

I do not believe the policy put forward is strong enough.

In the time the parties have been debating this policy our country has seen numerous environmental disasters on a scale rarely seen before, all condensed into a few short months, and all repeated numerous times within this period.

We are also seeing Antarctica melt at an unprecedented pace, not to mention the fact that there is basically no Arctic at all anymore. And let's not forget that species within the world's ecosystem are quietly becoming increasingly extinct.

Through the current world financial situation governments of the world have been given the power to force the big business polluters to change their ways and yet the current policy subsidises their activity and ensures they will have the means to continue their current systems with only minor restrictions until 2020.

How can that possibly be found to be the correct course of action? If one looks back at the environmental and climatic changes within only the last ten years, can we really afford to continue being so complacent for another ten?

We elected a government to make a difference, not excuses. It seems to me Penny Wong is only in the position she is in because she has a remarkable ability to never actually answer any of the important questions. From her statements it is clear she has no interest in making a change, but a strong interest in protecting the large companies from having to even consider making changes until at least 2020. Why?

They have been reaping the rewards for countless years now, isn't it time someone forced them to reinvest some of their profit to bring the industry into line with safe and sustainable practices?

It is possible to use this situation to improve the country's systems. Open the competition up to new ideas and new designs and yet we are protecting the dinosaur attitudes that built us into this situation in the first place. We are trying to ensure their success in their current model until 2020...Why? What do we owe them? Big business NEVER does the public any favours, why should the government provide this favour to them (on our, unrequested or supported behalf).

NOT GOOD ENOUGH PENNY

YOUR LOYALTY IS TO THE COUNTRY, NOT TO THE INDUSTRY

STOP TRYING TO STIFLE OUR OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

START RECOGNISING THE PROMISE THAT PUT YOU INTO POWER

THE TIME FOR POLITICAL AGENDA ON THIS ISSUE IS OVER

ITS TIME TO MAKE A (SIGNIFICANT) CHANGE

Increasingly concerned citizen.

Richard Gorr

It is with grave concern for the state of the environment I am making this submission. Of course the economy is important but I am sure you do not understand the full implications of taking Climate change lightly.

So much emphasis is placed upon the economy, but if the planet is neglected, and the rapid climate changes accelerate as they will this year, there may be no economy to look after. Please take this as a serious warning that the state of the environment is your No 1 concern.

In connection to money being spent to generate the economy, please do not bend to pressure, use this money to create a positive future for Australia by making us an environmental leader in new green technologies, the implications of neglecting this is too dire to overlook.

You are graced with the position to make courageous choices to aid the world and initiate forward positive directions, please do not let us and the planet down.

Regards

Virginia Casey

To those with the power to strengthen this policy

This is an urgent plea to bring pressure on the Government to reduce Australian greenhouse pollution by a lot more than its current target - 50% of 1990 levels is needed.

Also its CPRS needs revision. It currently over compensates the big polluters at the expense of everyone else and the environment.

Thank you for listening to this plea

Anne McPhee

It is crucial that we work harder to reduce carbon emissions. A 5-15% reduction over such a long period of time is not enough. There are many areas where we as Australians can work toward a higher goal. You as our government need to be more committed. Solar panels on all new homes should be implemented quickly AND businesses should also be given huge incentives to be more efficient.

Susan Cross

I continue to be deeply disappointed in the Australian Government's weak response to its mandate to undertake significant climate change action. It appears as if the powerful and sustained voices of the polluters' lobbyists have held sway with MPs and Cabinet. I understand that Australia is a small player on the global climate stage but the recent pronouncements from Washington show that the time is right to be seen at an international level as part of the leadership for change. Short-term industry bottom lines and political expediency need to be put to one side now. The science is overwhelming, the damage is already occurring and 11 years of denial and obfuscation have long past. I applaud the efforts, the rigour and also the passion of the work undertaken by Professor Ross Garnot and his team. I was disturbed by the muting of his call to action which seemed to occur between the release of his interim and final reports. I have optimism in the capacity of Australia to innovat

e, adapt and capitalise on the opportunities within new industries as part of a renewable energy future. I trust that our Government and all parliamentarians will grasp the climate nettle in order to bring our emissions down to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020. As a parent of teenagers I do not want to be having to explain to future grandchildren how we did so little for so long to avoid damaging climate change. I implore all Senators participating in the inquiry into the proposed climate change policy to ask themselves the same question -could you honestly tell your grandchildren you did all you could?

thank you

David Poulier

It is time to show strong leadership on climate change and commit to a reduction of 50% by 2020.

We live in a market economy and those industries who have called for free market policies should stand by their words and adapt to changing markets. They should not be supported by government but rather encouraged to evolve to more sustainable practices. Without any real financial incentives industries won't change their polluting ways.

Many Australians are making big efforts to combat climate change. The Government should encourage this through incentive schemes. Imagine if the recent cash payouts had been limited to certain green investments. Solar panels, water tanks, more efficient light bulbs. The money would still have entered the economy, new green industries would have been encouraged, and individuals would have tools that could save them money during 'tough economic times'.

Climate change isn't going away just because we are in an economic downturn. What we need now is creativity, innovation and leadership from our government.

Your Sincerely,

Renee Boucher

Is democracy so flawed that we cannot vote to avoid our own destruction? If need be you should hold a referendum and you would see that you are not representing the people that voted you in rather the much smaller and more vocal group who insist on maintaining their ludicrous lifestyles. I believe that climate change policy should be costly to Australians because there is no doubt it will pay off in the long run, so please recognise the necessity as well as the public opinion. As an aside I don't think it matters whether or not other states are reducing equally especially developing states, please encourage them to but it should have no bearing on the policies we choose. It is immoral to expect states which struggle to feed their population, to make any sort of sacrifice when we are not willing to go without giant TVs or city 4WDs.

We need strong leaders to take bold steps not double-crossing surrender-monkeys who promise environmental change and come up with this sort of thing. Shame!

Tim Kaldor

I'm concerned at the rate that the Rudd government is losing credibility and goodwill over its weakness in the face of industry on its targets. The cap removes the incentives for individuals to do their bit, and for industry and the community to both be pressuring each other on the issue.

Industry's self-interested position is exposed by its moves to protect its interests in the face of climate change, while arguing for the minimum at a government policy level. Yet the government has caved in to that sector while the community concern is not being harnessed. It reeks of the Labor right politics in NSW - the Federal government needs to position itself as not susceptible to pressure from the coal industry and its bodgy technological solutions.

While climate change should not be promoted as an opportunity for new ways to make money, Australia does have a chance to belatedly develop alternative energy technologies and take a leadership role on the issue internationally. The current financial crisis has bankrupted the positions of those arguing against this leadership role. The Rudd government should take advantage of this financial catastrophe to listen to scientists and actually address the climate change crisis. If that does not happen, the anger and regret that will be generated in the future will overwhelm all the government's other achievements.

Anna Russell



Are you people not listening to Professor Garnaut?

Clive

Dear Sir/Madam,

It greatly concerns me that governments around the world are not taking strong enough action to prevent environmental disasters of massive proportions. All governments need to urgently increase their targets to reduce greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

The ice is melting!!! And governments are still twiddling their thumbs worrying about the economic consequences. What about the HUMAN consequences?!! We have an obligation to not only protect our own environment but also the world environment which many other peoples are trying to habitate. I am deeply concerned for those peoples living on islands and low lying land some of whom are already having to relocate.

Why are industries still getting away with wasteful and pollutant work practices that should have been outlawed long ago? All governments must be looking towards building renewable energy sources instead of compensating existing industries for continued pollution of our precious environment.

My daughter is 15 and I want her to be able to enjoy her life in a sustainable world not a wanton and wasteful one. It is time to clean up our act, make some tough decisions and take decisive action to save our planet from human greed and destruction!!!

Do ordinary Australian citizens really have to wait until something terrible happens to our country before our government will take responsible action to protect our environment??? Of course by then it will be too late and my daughter will have to watch the disaster unfold!

I strongly urge you to take proactive action to save our precious world for the benefit of all humanity.

Sincerely,

A 5-15% target was not what I voted Labor for - the electorate was led to believe that Labor would deliver much more nationally and internationally responsible targets than these. The current policy seems to be profoundly flawed and recent economic stimulus packages do not seem to be maximising the opportunities presented by the economic 'crisis' to give a significant boost to our chances of a greener, safer future. Further, there seems to be little in current policy to REALLY encourage and reward ordinary people for making greener choices. I fully endorse an enquiry into the government's climate policies and related spending.

Bev Sibthorpe PhD

I strongly support a stronger CPRS target. It is clear to me that the proposed targets are much too low. Climate change is happening faster than predicted and we need strong and firm Government action to lead the country forward. I also disagree with the level of overcompensation the scheme provides to pollution businesses as well as the lack of real incentive to everyday Australians to make a difference themselves.

Please reconsider this scheme and provide something that will make a real difference.

Piers Hartley

There is enormous goodwill amongst citizens to reduce emissions but the government's weak, inadequate target prevents effective, individual actions being realised into genuine, national reductions. It is critical to increase these targets before the UN Conference in December. Our parliament, working for the people of Australia, must surely be able to achieve stronger targets and a better designed scheme.

Geraldine Hunt

I am very happy with most of the Government initiatives so far and feel they are doing a sterling job. The only issue that needs more determination is climate change. Big business have obviously been in the ear of Government pressing them for more time to continue to pollute. It's time for this to stop as we cannot waste another minute. It's time that Governments and business worked on green solutions and created jobs out of this. Australia could be a world leader in this regard, using solar, wind, geothermal etc. instead of a world polluter with their dirty coal exports. Time to lead once again Kevin.

Lynda Cord

Last year I watched with interest and hope for the future as Professor Garnaut delivered his report to the government on the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. However I believe the scheme that is planned is too weak to do any good, and according to new scientific findings climate change is happening at an astonishing speed. We have passed the tipping point and it may already be too late according to some scientists in the UK. With jobs in the mining sector already being cut, now is the time to act decisively and invest in renewable energy to bring about the changes we need. David McRae

Climate change is happening now and faster than predicted. We must reduce greenhouse pollution much faster and further than the government's current targets.

The CPRS compensates polluters and will put people off changing to greener technologies - this is being discussed by the general community as appalling even before it has started.

We need a well designed scheme to drastically reduce emissions while giving Australian industry opportunities to develop and manufacture renewable energies.

If we don't act quickly or extensively enough the fallout will be much greater than many realise in numerous ways that get little coverage in the media eg one example - many exotic plant species are likely to be advantaged by climate change and become serious agricultural and/or environmental weeds costing millions in agricultural production and loss of ecosystem services.

I want my children and grandchildren to experience the cloudforest on top of Lord Howe Island. A few years ago I thought it was my great grand children who could miss out. I realise now it is much more imminent than that.

Please act on my behalf.

Cathy Willis



Dear Sir / Madam,

I strongly have the opinion that governments should disclose the level of practical concern that they have on matters of climate change. This would notably be through substantial and non churlish setting of national and then international carbon emissions targets. Individuals and the world economic institutions need this guideline system.

Thankyou for your attention.

Sincerely, Albert Hempel.

We are of the earth, preserving it and being good stewards of our planet which is our ethical and moral responsibility as the dominant life form on this planet is the No 1 priority.

Barrie Styles

To our elected representatives in the Australian parliament.

We urge you to be visionary and bold in the development of policy and targets in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Current targets will not bring about the change that is essential for the health and survival of life on the planet as we know it. Nowhere near enough has been done yet.

History is already harshly judging the lack of heed taken so far to the predictions of catastrophic climate change. You have an enormous responsibility - and you are paid - to respond with good governance on this issue.

Dr Mary Belfrage & Dr Niall Quiery

Australia could be a leader in the world on environmental responsibility. Our current targets are so weak as to be an embarrassment. We cannot ignore the science of the ever-increasing and quickening effects of climate change. We should be positive in our actions, not rewarding or encouraging continued outdated polluting industries but developing and encouraging new sustainable ones, for the greater good of the whole world. Allow us to take significant action, be leaders in the world beyond international aparty politics. Please review your strategy as a matter of urgency.

Regards

Miriam ABud