

5/13 Chandler St.
Belconnen
ACT 2617

15 December 2008

The Hon. Bob McMullan, MP
Member for Fraser
Unit 8
1 Torrens St
Braddon ACT 2612

Dear Mr McMullan,

I'm a resident of the Fraser electorate and wrote to you on 16 August this year concerning global warming. Thank you for your reply, which I received dated 21 August.

Unfortunately, your reply large misses the point I was making in my letter. While it's true that an Emissions Trading Scheme is the only sensible framework in which to reduce Australia's greenhouse emissions, that doesn't preclude further government action to make it easier for individuals and businesses to meet (or exceed) the targets set by the scheme.

More importantly, an ETS is only an adequate response with aggressive reduction targets, based on the available science. As you acknowledge in your reply, the reality of global warming, and its appalling consequences are no longer in doubt.

Which is why words fail me to express my anger and disappointment at the pathetic, piss-weak 5% reduction target announced today by Kevin Rudd. I, like many, supported the Rudd government in the last election because you promised real action on climate change, but with this decision you have betrayed that mandate.

The government's own report from Professor Garnaut, not to mention every other credible study, makes it clear that much bigger, much faster reductions are necessary to avoid catastrophe. Reports from the Treasury and various economists estimate that the economic cost of much stronger reduction targets would be essentially negligible in the medium to long term. To avoid the disastrous effects of climate change on our lives and the economy, emissions must be dramatically reduced worldwide. How can we ask other governments to set strong targets if we will not do so ourselves?

Furthermore, the plan to issue a large proportion of permits under the ETS free of charge to the biggest polluters is sheer folly. It makes no sense environmentally: the biggest polluting industries are the ones which must implement the biggest changes if we are to avoid disaster. Nor does it make sense economically: the biggest polluters are the places to look for the biggest, easiest and cheapest reductions, so it's silly to focus the economic incentive to reduce emissions onto everyone else, where reductions will be more piecemeal, more difficult and more

costly.

So, again, as I said in my previous letter: Please, I beg you, for myself and for the next generation, start treating climate change with the awful gravity it demands. Urge the Prime Minister to revise this disastrously weak and wholly irresponsible target.

Yours sincerely,

David Gibson

cc: Senator Kate Lundy