

Federal Government's 'Green Paper' and proposed Emissions Trading Scheme

*Community and Business Consultation
in Latrobe City*

August 2008

for
**Pro Vice-Chancellor's Office
Monash University Gippsland Campus**

Prepared by:
Gippsland Research & Information Service (GRIS)
School of Humanities, Communications and Social Science
Monash University Gippsland Campus
Phone: 5122 6418
Email: gris@arts.monash.edu.au

INDEX

Community Results

Q1. Have you heard of the 'Green Paper'?.....	1
Q2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy?.....	1
Q3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect	1
(q4. qualifier) Are you currently employed?.....	1
Q4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect.....	2
Q5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions?	2
Q6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability - Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies?.....	2
Q7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced	2
Q8. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (broad groupings) – Community Responses	2
Q8. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (coded sub-groups) – Community Responses	3
Demographics	4
Q9. Age group of respondents	4
Q10. Gender of respondents	4
Location of respondents.....	4

Business Results

Q1. Have you heard of the 'Green Paper'?.....	5
Q2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy?.....	5
Q3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect	5
Q4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect.....	5
Q5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions?	6
Q6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability. - Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies?.....	6
Q7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced	6
Q8. Do you think the level of uncertainty surrounding the introduction of the Emissions Trading Scheme may effect your business?	6
Q9. Do you believe an Emissions Trading Scheme will have a positive or negative effect on your business investment decisions?.....	6
Q10. Should the Federal Government press ahead with the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme if it effects Australia's international competitiveness?	7
Q11. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (broad groupings) – Business Responses	7
Q11. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (coded sub-groups) – Business Responses	8
Business characteristics	9
Q12. Number of employees	9
Industry category.....	9
Location of business	9

Appendices

Appendix 1: Community Consultation Survey 2008 (Latrobe City) on the Federal Government's Green Paper.....	11
Appendix 2: Business Consultation Survey 2008 (Latrobe City) on the Federal Government's Green Paper.....	12
Appendix 3: Community Comments.....	13
Appendix 4: Business Comments.....	19

DISCLAIMER

Any representation, statement, opinion or advice, expressed or implied in this publication is made in good faith but on the basis that the Gippsland Research & Information Service, Monash University its agents and employees are not liable (whether by reason of negligence, lack of care or otherwise) to any person for any damage or loss whatsoever which has occurred or may occur in relation to that person taking or not taking (as the case may be) action in respect of any representation, statement, or advice referred to above.

Federal Government's 'Green Paper' and proposed Emissions Trading Scheme

Community and Business Consultation in Latrobe City August 2008

Community Results Total responses = 300

The following is the frequency of responses from the a telephone survey conducted by Gippsland Research and Information Service, HUMCASS, Monash University Gippsland Campus, with residents of Latrobe City on their awareness and opinion of the recently released Australian Federal Government's Green Paper which includes a proposal to introduce an Emissions Trading Scheme.

Methodology:

A total of 300 completed surveys were collected from Latrobe City residents. Data collection was via telephone interviews using a questionnaire which was developed by the Steering Committee in consultation with GRIS. Potential respondents for the community consultation were randomly selected from the electronic Whitepages telephone directory using a population proportionate sampling method. Interviewing was conducted during the evenings of 12th and 13th August 2008.

Community Survey Response rate:

A total of 1,275 phone calls were made to achieve the target of 300 completed community surveys resulting in a 1:4 ratio or 24% response rate. Around 28% (n=359) of the total calls made were recorded as 'refused or declined' to take part in the study. The remaining 616 (48%) unsuccessful attempted calls made included 'no answer', 'disconnected numbers', 'engaged' on first or subsequent attempts, 'call backs', fax/answering machines.

Q1. Have you heard of the 'Green Paper'?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	156	52.0
No	141	47.0
Don't Know	3	1.0
Total	300	100.0

Q2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	37	12.3
Yes, partially	48	16.0
No (includes 'not heard of it')	215	71.7
Total	300	100.0

Q3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect ...

	a. Investment in Gippsland industries		b. Prospects for future jobs	
	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents
Positively	42	14.0	50	16.7
Negatively	130	43.3	123	41.0
Don't Know	128	42.7	127	42.3
Total	300	100.0	300	100.0

(q4. qualifier) Are you currently employed?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	158	52.7
No	142	47.3
Total	300	100.0

Q4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect.....

	a. Your personal budget		b. Your job security		c. The business you work in	
	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	133	44.3	47	29.7	53	33.5
No	76	25.3	79	50.0	75	47.5
Don't Know	91	30.3	32	20.3	30	19.0
Total	300	100.0	158	100.0	158	100.0
Not employed (not applicable)			142		142	

Q5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	242	80.7
No	11	3.7
Don't Know	47	15.7
Total	300	100.0

Q6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability.**Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies?**

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	245	81.7
No	21	7.0
Don't Know	34	11.3
Total	300	100.0

Q7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced

	No. of responses	% of respondents
After more consultation with communities	96	32.0
As soon as possible	56	18.7
In the long-term	51	17.0
Don't Know	93	31.0
Refused to answer (<i>Not at all</i>)	4	1.3
Total	300	100.0

Q8. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (broad groupings) – Community Responses

	No. of comments	% of Respondents
Not aware of it/Need more information	54	38.0
Economic Impact - Negative	25	17.6
Use or find alternative solutions/power source	14	9.9
Needs to be global approach	11	7.7
Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it	10	7.0
General supportive of ETS	9	6.3
General negative to ETS	8	5.6
Need more research to reduce emissions	7	4.9
Good concept but process/implementation needs research	6	4.2
Neutral comment	4	2.8
Improve environmental and sustainable practices	3	2.1
Go ahead/no other option	2	1.4
Total comments	153	

*allows for multiple response (No of respondents = 142)

A full list of comments is provided in Appendix 3.

Q8. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (coded sub-groups) – Community Responses

	No. of comments	% of Respondents
Not aware of it/Need more information	39	27.5
Lack of understanding of what effects it will have	7	4.9
Don't understand it/confused	7	4.9
Where does the money go/how will it be used	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>38.0</i>
Detrimental to Australian/local economy	11	7.7
Increased costs/another tax	9	6.3
Economic Impact - Negative	2	1.4
Hidden agenda/Money making exercise	1	0.7
Large industry/Government are the only ones to gain	1	0.7
Target businesses, not community	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>17.6</i>
Alternative energy/power source	8	5.6
Clean up the coal industry	6	4.2
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>9.9</i>
Support ETS but global approach	4	2.8
Australian emissions are minor compared to other countries	4	2.8
It is a global issue	3	2.1
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>7.7</i>
Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it	5	3.5
Lacks common sense/it won't work	3	2.1
Knee-jerk reaction	2	1.4
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>7.0</i>
General supportive of ETS	5	3.5
Support but I need more information	2	1.4
Supportive but it's a bit late	1	0.7
Costs will force community to conserve energy/usage	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>6.3</i>
General negative to ETS	6	4.2
ETS equals right to pollute	2	1.4
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>5.6</i>
Need more research to reduce emissions	3	2.1
Greenhouse effect is a cyclical issue	3	2.1
ETS money to be used for research and development	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4.9</i>
Good concept but process/implementation needs research	5	3.5
ETS is only a short-term solution	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>4.2</i>
Neutral comment	4	2.8
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2.8</i>
Improve environmental and sustainable practices	1	0.7
Preserve the environment and forest, etc.	1	0.7
Environmentally friendly buildings/houses/manufacturing	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.1</i>
Go ahead/no other option	1	0.7
Follow international standards	1	0.7
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1.4</i>
Total comments	153	

*allows for multiple response (No of respondents = 142)
A full list of comments is provided in Appendix 3.

Demographics**Q9. Age group of respondents**

	No. of responses	% of respondents
18 - 24 years	14	4.7
25 - 34 years	23	7.7
35 - 44 years	52	17.3
45 - 54 years	73	24.3
55 - 64 years	55	18.3
65+ years	83	27.7
Total	300	100.0

Q10. Gender of respondents

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Male	122	40.7
Female	178	59.3
Total	300	100.0

Location of respondents

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Traralgon	84	28.0
Morwell	75	25.0
Moe	43	14.3
Newborough	28	9.3
Churchill	25	8.3
Yallourn North	7	2.3
Glengarry	5	1.7
Traralgon East	5	1.7
Boolarra	3	1.0
Toongabbie	3	1.0
Yinnar	3	1.0
Hazelwood North	2	0.7
Moe South	2	0.7
Newborough East	2	0.7
Tyers	2	0.7
Budgerie	1	0.3
Callignee	1	0.3
Driffield	1	0.3
Flynn	1	0.3
Hazelwood South	1	0.3
Hernes Oak	1	0.3
Jeeralang	1	0.3
Jeeralang Junction	1	0.3
Jumbuk	1	0.3
Koornalla	1	0.3
Traralgon South	1	0.3
Total	300	100.0

Business Results

Total responses = 200

The following is the frequency of responses from the a telephone survey conducted by Gippsland Research and Information Service, HUMCASS, Monash University Gippsland Campus, with businesses across Latrobe City on their awareness and opinion of the recently released Australian Federal Government's Green Paper which includes a proposal to introduce an Emissions Trading Scheme.

Methodology

A total of 200 completed surveys were collected from Latrobe City businesses. Data collection was via telephone interviews (and in a few cases via email or fax: 12 potential responses) using a questionnaire which was developed by the Steering Committee in consultation with GRIS. Potential respondents for the business consultation were randomly selected from a recently developed Latrobe City business database. Due to the topic of the study interviews were conducted with the Owner, CEO, Manager or most senior person of the organisation as they were deemed to be the most appropriate person to respond on behalf of the business. In the main, responses were collected from a proportionate sample across industry type and size of business. Although as requested, for the purpose of this project a slightly higher proportion of responses were collected from larger employers within the region. Interviewing was conducted during business hours from 13th to 15th of August 2008.

Business Survey Response rate:

A total of 779 phone calls were made to achieve the target of 200 completed business surveys resulting in a 1:4 ratio or 26% response rate. Almost 21% (n=162) of the total calls made to businesses were recorded as 'refused or declined' to take part in the study. The remaining 417 (53%) unsuccessful attempted calls made included 'no answer', 'disconnected or no longer in business', 'appropriate person to respond (ie Manager, CEO, Owner) not available, 'engaged' on first or subsequent attempts, 'call backs', etc.

Q1. Have you heard of the 'Green Paper'?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	102	51.0
No	98	49.0
Total	200	100.0

Q2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	9	4.5
Yes, partially	44	22.0
No (includes 'not heard of it')	147	73.5
Total	200	100.0

Q3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect ...

	a. Investment in Gippsland industries		b. Prospects for future jobs	
	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents
Positively	26	13.0	30	15.0
Negatively	104	52.0	102	51.0
Don't Know	70	35.0	68	34.0
Total	200	100.0	200	100.0

Q4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect.....

	a. Your business budget		b. Your business security	
	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	89	44.5	66	33.0
No	77	38.5	92	46.0
Don't Know	30	15.0	38	19.0
Refused to answer	4	2.0	4	2.0
Total	200	100.0	200	100.0

Q5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	181	90.5
No	5	2.5
Don't Know	14	7.0
Total	200	100.0

Q6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability.**Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies?**

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	171	85.5
No	12	6.0
Don't Know	17	8.5
Total	200	100.0

Q7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced

	No. of responses	% of respondents
After more consultation with communities/business	63	31.5
As soon as possible	39	19.5
In the long-term	43	21.5
Don't Know	43	21.5
Refused to answer (<i>Not at all</i>)	12	6.0
Total	200	100.0

Q8. Do you think the level of uncertainty surrounding the introduction of the Emissions Trading Scheme may effect your business?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	75	37.5
No	80	40.0
Don't Know	44	22.0
Refused to answer	1	0.5
Total	200	100.0

Q9. Do you believe an Emissions Trading Scheme will have a positive or negative effect on your business investment decisions?

	a. Short-term (6-12 months)		b. Long-term (3-5 years)	
	No. of responses	% of respondents	No. of responses	% of respondents
Positively	13	6.5	25	12.5
Negatively	50	25.0	50	25.0
Don't Know	83	41.5	80	40.0
"There will be no effect"	54	27.0	45	22.5
Total	200	100.0	200	100.0

Q10. Should the Federal Government press ahead with the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme if it effects Australia's international competitiveness?

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Yes	59	29.5
No	78	39.0
Don't Know	63	31.5
Total	200	100.0

Q11. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (broad groupings) – Business Responses

	No. of comments	% of Respondents
Not aware of it/Need more information	49	44.5
Economic Impact - Negative	20	18.2
Needs to be global approach	14	12.7
Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it	13	11.8
Use or find alternative solutions/power source	13	11.8
General supportive of ETS	6	5.5
Improve environmental and sustainable practices	6	5.5
Good concept but process/implementation needs research	5	4.5
Go ahead/no other option	4	3.6
General negative to ETS	3	2.7
Need more research to reduce emissions	2	1.8
Neutral comment	1	0.9
Total comments	136	

*allows for multiple response (No of respondents = 110)
A full list of comments is provided in Appendix 4.

**Q11. Further comments on Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme (coded sub-groups)
– Business Responses**

	No. of responses	% of Respondents
Not aware of it/Need more information	31	28.2
Lack of understanding of what effects it will have	12	10.9
Don't understand it/confused	5	4.5
Where does the money go/how will it be used	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>44.5</i>
Detrimental to Australian/local economy	8	7.3
Increased costs/another tax	6	5.5
Small business will suffer	3	2.7
Rewards/compensation for those who reduce pollution (carbon credits)	2	1.8
Large industry/Government are the only ones to gain	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>18.2</i>
Australian emissions are minor compared to other countries	7	6.4
It is a global issue	6	5.5
Negative ETS but global approach	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>12.7</i>
Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it	4	3.6
Only one point of view / propaganda	3	2.7
Decision is already made / done deal	3	2.7
Lacks common sense/it won't work	2	1.8
Complicated document	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>11.8</i>
Use or find alternative solutions/power source	1	0.9
Clean up the coal industry	7	6.4
Alternative energy/power source	4	3.6
All industries to clean up their act	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>11.8</i>
General supportive of ETS	5	4.5
Supportive but it's a bit late	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5.5</i>
Preserve the environment and forest, etc.	3	2.7
Environmentally friendly buildings/houses/manufacturing	2	1.8
Water is a higher priority	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5.5</i>
Good concept but process/implementation needs research	2	1.8
Dependant on how it is implemented	2	1.8
It needs a realistic timeframe for implementation	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4.5</i>
Proceed with caution	2	1.8
Go ahead/no other option	1	0.9
Businesses to take a positive approach to this	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3.6</i>
General negative to ETS	2	1.8
ETS equals right to pollute	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.7</i>
Need more research to reduce emissions	2	1.8
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1.8</i>
Neutral comment	1	0.9
<i>Sub Total</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0.9</i>
Total	136	

*allows for multiple response (No of respondents = 110)
A full list of comments is provided in Appendix 4.

Business characteristics**Q12. Number of employees**

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Non-employed (Self-employed only)	28	14.0
1 - 4 employees	75	37.5
5 - 19 employees	63	31.5
20 - 49 employees	13	6.5
50 - 99 employees	7	3.5
100 - 199 employees	9	4.5
200+ employees	5	2.5
Total	200	100.0

Industry category

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	3	1.5
Manufacturing	11	5.5
Electricity, Gas, Water and Waste Services	2	1.0
Construction	30	15.0
Wholesale Trade	5	2.5
Retail	34	17.0
Accommodation and Food Services	11	5.5
Transport, Postal and Warehousing	6	3.0
Information Media and Telecommunications	5	2.5
Financial and Insurance Services	4	2.0
Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services	2	1.0
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	14	7.0
Administrative and Support Services	10	5.0
Public Administration and Safety	3	1.5
Education and Training	7	3.5
Health Care and Social Assistance	16	8.0
Arts and Recreation Services	9	4.5
Other	28	14.0
Total	200	100.0

Location of business

	No. of responses	% of respondents
Traralgon	75	37.5
Morwell	69	34.5
Moe	27	13.5
Churchill	9	4.5
Newborough	4	2.0
Glengarry	3	1.5
Yallourn North	3	1.5
Boolarra	2	1.0
Hazelwood North	2	1.0
Yinnar	2	1.0
Hernes Oak	1	0.5
Maryvale	1	0.5
Moe South	1	0.5
Tyers	1	0.5
Total	200	100.0

Appendices

Appendix 1: Community Consultation Survey 2008 (Latrobe City) on the Federal Government's Green Paper

Intro....

Survey ID: Interviewer: Phone: Town/Suburb:

1. Firstly, have you heard of the 'Green Paper'? Yes No D/K
(if No or D/K go to Q3)

2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy? Yes Yes, partially No

3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect

	Positively	Negatively	Don't know
a. Investment in Gippsland Industries			
b. Prospects for future jobs			

4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. Your personal budget			
Are you in paid employment? (If No go to q5)			
b. Your job security			
c. The business you work in			

5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions? Yes No D/K

6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability. Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies? Yes No D/K

7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced:
 After more consultation with communities As soon as possible In the long-term D/K

8. Would you like to make any further comments about the Green Paper or the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme?

DEMOGRAPHICS

Finally, just a couple of questions about yourself.

9. Can you please tell me which of the following age groups you fall into? (READ OUT GROUPS)

10. And finally, Can I record your gender as: Male Female

Thank you very much for your time

Appendix 2: Business Consultation Survey 2008 (Latrobe City) on the Federal Government's Green Paper

Intro....

Survey ID: Interviewer: Phone: Town/Suburb:

1. Firstly, have you heard of the 'Green Paper'? Yes No D/K
(if No or D/K go to Q3)

2. Do you understand how the measures proposed in the Green Paper will effect the Latrobe City economy? Yes Yes, partially No

3. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could positively or negatively effect

	Positively	Negatively	Don't know
a. Investment in Gippsland Industries			
b. Prospects for future jobs			

4. Do you think the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme could negatively effect

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. Your business budget			
b. Your business security			

5. Do you think additional research needs to be undertaken to find alternative ways of treating carbon emissions? Yes No D/K

6. It has been suggested that new technology such as 'clean coal' could improve environmental performance and sustainability. Do you think we need more investment into researching these technologies? Yes No D/K

7. Do you think an Emissions Trading Scheme should be introduced:
 After more consultation with communities/businesses As soon as possible In the long-term D/K

8. Do you think the level of uncertainty surrounding the introduction of the Emissions Trading Scheme may effect your business? Yes No D/K

9. Do you believe an Emissions Trading Scheme will have a positive or negative effect on your

	Positive	Negative	Don't know
a. short-term business investment decisions? (6-12 months)			
b. long-term business investment decisions? (3-5 years)			

10. Should the Federal Government press ahead with the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme if it effects Australia's international competitiveness? Yes No D/K

11. Would you like to make any further comments about the Green Paper or the introduction of an Emissions Trading Scheme?

BUSINESS DEMOGRAPHICS

Finally, just a couple of questions about your business establishment.

12. Can you please tell me how many people you currently employ? (READ OUT GROUPS)

13. And finally, which of the following industry category does your business fall within? (READ OUT INDUSTRY)

Thank you very much for your time

Appendix 3: Community Comments

Not Aware of it/Need more information

Not Aware of it/Need more information

- A lot of it is political, but there needs to be a lot more consultation with the community.
- I don't know a lot about it. I think that money should not be the main concern in this decision.
- Would like more information out there for everyone.
- They definitely need to look into it further and more consultations with the community and businesses needs to occur.
- The more knowledge and information out there, the better for everyone.
- The information needs to be more accessible to the community.
- The general public should be made more aware of these issues. I have not heard or read anything really of this.
- Not really, as a stay at home mum I'm not up-to-date with current Government proposals.
- No, I think you should get in contact with people who are much younger and knowledgeable.
- No, I know nothing about it.
- No, I haven't seen the Green Paper!
- No, I haven't seen the Green Paper so I can't comment on it.
- No, I don't know enough to comment.
- No, I'm not really aware of what it entails.
- If I had seen the Green Paper I might have more to say about it.
- I wouldn't like to make any further comments as I don't know enough about it.
- I would like to read the Green Paper before commenting.
- I would like to know where to find the Green Paper as I don't know about it.
- I would like to know what the Green Paper is.
- I would like to know more about both the Green Paper and the Emissions Trading Scheme.
- I still don't know enough about it to comment.
- I know nothing at all about it.
- I haven't seen the Green Paper so I can't comment.
- I haven't heard one thing about the Green Paper and know very little about the Emissions Trading Scheme.
- I have not read the Green Paper so I cannot comment further. I will however, endeavour to research it further.
- I have no knowledge of this proposal due to poor or non existent communication about it.
- I feel that there should have been a lot more consultation with communities, particularly with grass roots people.
- I don't understand anything about the scheme.
- I don't really know much about the Emissions Trading Scheme so therefore I think the community needs more information.
- I don't know what the Green Paper means.
- I don't know enough to comment.
- I don't know anything about it.
- I don't know anything about it.
- I don't know anything about it.
- I don't know anything about it at all so I find it very hard to comment.
- I believe that they need to speak to the ordinary people in simple language so they can fully understand all this talk that is going on.
- I'm not aware what the Green Paper is.
- I'd like to know more information about the Green Paper and the Emission Trading Scheme.
- A bit more information about it would be great for the community I think.

Lack of understanding of what effects it will have

- We need to see more information. The general public really needs to know more about the scheme and what sort of impact it will have.
- I don't think the ordinary people understand how this will affect them. As a result there tends to be a fear of how this will effect them financially. At the same time, I support protecting the environment.
- No, not until I know the full extent of the Green Paper.
- More information is needed explaining it in simple terms that most people will understand, ie what effects it will have, good or bad, on everyday living and future generations.
- I think I should read more about this if it will effect me in the long run, along with everyone else.
- I don't know anything about the Emissions Trading Scheme and how it will effect me.
- I do not know anything about this Green Paper and very little of the effects of this Emissions Trading Scheme.

Don't understand it/confused

- There is so much confusion. We all want a greener environment but don't know if this is the answer.
- I think some of the terminology and phrases they use when talking about this confuses the run-of-the-mill person like me. The Government needs to simplify it so that people understand what the Emissions Scheme is and its consequences.
- I don't understand it a lot. I think they need to start consulting with the public in more common terms, rather than bamboozling the public with political jargon.
- I think the Green Paper needs to be in plain English so that the general public can pick up a brochure and understand it. At the moment even the people working on the project don't understand what it is about.
- I hear about it but do not have enough real knowledge to have an opinion. There seems to be very conflicting ideas thrown around.
- I haven't actually read it. You tend to only hear certain biased arguments. The Government need to produce a one page simple document, posing both the negatives and positives to familiarise the community about this.
- I'm at that age now where I don't understand any of this talk about carbon trading.

Where does the money go/how will it be used

- I want to know where the money is going when people are fined for using too much carbon emissions. I don't understand how charging someone makes them reduce their carbon output.

Economic Impact – Negative

Detrimental to Australian/local economy

- Don't make it too expensive for the coal generators. It is rumoured to be as high as 10% but it should be as low as 1%.
- I believe it all needs to be worked out properly as it could have a detrimental effect on the economy.
- I believe this would have a disastrous effect to penalise our companies compared to the world-wide effect.
- I can understand that they see the need for this but they need to take into consideration of people's livelihoods as it could be disastrous for the Valley.
- I see disaster from this. Australia will be negatively impacted as a result of the scheme. Our manufacturing will go to countries like China. I believe Australia contributes only 1.5% of the carbon emissions so unless China and USA do it then it's wasted.
- I think that it will be bad for Latrobe Valley but I think it is enviable.
- I'm against the Carbon Trading proposals. I think the proposal is crazy for Australia and this area. We are making a big mistake putting ourselves in economic risk when we are going to make little difference to the world's pollution.
- Instead of taxing Australians and sending the money overseas to countries like Japan who didn't ask for it, or don't want it. We should keep the money in our country by not putting a tax on emissions but looking at other ways to reduce them.
- It is going to be a big mistake for the future economy. It will force the local manufacturing industries offshore and other businesses to decline. Our daily costs will be increased yet the economy will eventually weaken due to limited jobs.
- The Government is playing politics (knee jerk reaction) which will massively effect the economy of the area.
- The problem needs to be addressed as a whole world thing. If locally we lost jobs to overseas countries, these places might not be addressing emissions problems and just make the whole issue even greater.

Increased costs/another tax

- Any emission scheme will cost individuals in the long-term as we will all end up paying for it.
- I haven't seen the GP but scientists are finding that we're not causing the greenhouse effect. The Trading Scheme is just another tax grab. I don't see how this money can fix any problem. Reducing emissions is a good thing but it needs to be taken slowly.
- I think the thing that will turn people against it is that it will go back to user pays and there has to be a limit to how much the user pays.
- I think the whole thing is a bit of a farce. Just something to claim more tax on and stir up public problems. I think global warming etc is a lot of hog wash. It used to be all about "hole in the ozone" etc. and this is just the next barrow to push.
- I would like to have more information on how this will affect day to day budgeting for families. Also how it will affect fuel costs and whether traveling to my job in Drouin will still be cost effective.
- I would only like to make mention that it is no good unless everyone is behind it. I believe it is just another tax collect.
- Is this going to be viable for the average Joe Blow on the street?
- We don't know what the end result will be and what it will cost us in the future. Just putting taxes on it is not the answer.

- We will have to pay higher prices for everything.

Economic Impact - Negative

- Further understanding of how the scheme will be implemented, what it effects and the flow-on costs towards the community.
- I think Kevin Rudd has rushed into something without fully understanding what it is and what impact it will have.

Hidden agenda/Money making exercise

- How do they intend to monitor carbon emissions? There must be a better way. There are too many experts with hidden agendas, someone is going to make a lot of money!

Large industry/Government are the only ones to gain

- The whole foundation is about making money for Government and big business. These schemes are introduced just to make more money out of everyone. All the businesses that make pollution will gain most from more taxes and costs to the people?

Target businesses, not community

- They should target businesses and major companies rather than the individual.

Use or find alternative solutions/power source

Alternative energy/power source

- Find alternatives to coal, such as solar, before introducing a Carbon Tax.
- I believe in solar power.
- I think in a way it is hypocritical because people have invented cars that use way less petrol and big companies have bought them out in the past as too many people have made too much money out of oil.
- I think that nuclear power is the way we should be heading.
- Nuclear energy should be looked into.
- Overall, we may eventually lose coal power, but we would benefit by being a world leader in producing technology for cleaner energy. Coal is only a short-term resource.
- Solar technology should be investigated more. After all, that is always going to be there, if it was not, nothing would matter anyway!
- We need to be looking into more alternatives to coal.

Clean up the coal industry

- I believe they could use clean coal now - why can't we use it when the Japanese already do?
- I can't really comment on the Green Paper as I haven't read it but I do believe they have to do something to counteract the pollution in the area.
- I have a strong belief that we have to find cleaner energy or find a way to capture the emissions effectively.
- I have had a history of working in the power industry and I know they could be cleaned up. Whether the Emissions Trading Scheme would be good enough or not I don't know.
- I think that we should be looking after our coal and our environment.
- Someone has to pay for it all. Other countries produce more emissions than us. It would be more sensible to clean up the relatively cheap coal industry we have before embarking on something new. The Government is just jumping on the band wagon.

Needs to be global approach

Support ETS but global approach

- All countries need to take action - China and India are causing problems for every one. These countries need to be sorted out. I think it is a waste of time if others don't come on board.
- Australia shouldn't do this alone. Without all countries participating in an emissions scheme there will be little impact on improving global warming.
- I believe it should be done as quickly as possible. I realise there are implications for some people but the planet needs these reins pulled back; not just locally, it is a global thing.
- I think these measures will have a positive effect. The unfortunate thing is if China and the USA don't come aboard, we are only a tiny drop in the ocean and it probably won't do much good overall.

Australian emissions are minor compared to other countries

- Assist in getting countries who have higher emissions to reduce their emissions. Our emissions are minor and are not going to make a difference on a larger scale.
- I don't believe this will effect the world's output as Australia's is .01% compared to the rest of the world.
- I think Rudd is flogging a dead horse. Other countries such as China create more emissions. It needs to start there.
- More should be done about countries which are cutting down all their trees and have worse pollution.

It is a global issue

- All countries should be looking into emission control schemes more.
- Carbon emissions is an effect world-wide.
- These emission problems cannot be tackled by Australia alone. Everyone needs to do their bit.

Green Paper - not enough thought has gone into it

Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it

- Emissions trading has been discredited for over five years. It is therefore difficult for the community, including myself, to have the information needed to make an informed decision about the Emissions Trading Scheme.
- I believe something needs to be done, but there needs to be a lot more research into the scheme and its effects before it is implemented.
- I believe that the scheme, although it's supposed to be serving a great purpose, has not been thought through enough. It's a policy-on-the-run. Labor made an election commitment but needed to put more thought upfront before they acted on it.
- I think it should have had more thought put into it.
- I'm not sure that they are going with the right model with the Emissions Trading Scheme.

Lacks common sense/it won't work

- I think that this proposal has just been put together by a bunch of bored people. I don't think it will work.
- I think this scheme lacks a considerable amount of common sense - not checking effects to the Australian economy with little effect on world counts. I believe Australia has little effect on world economies but these sorts of things are driven by politics.
- It's a lot of scare tactics, I honestly can't see them pumping it into the ground, yet with the clean coal I can see that happening.

Knee-jerk reaction

- I think it's a 'knee-jerk' reaction to the whole global warming scare. I don't agree with it.
- This is a knee-jerk reaction to something that has been coming for a long time.

General supportive of ETS

General supportive of ETS

- Although, this scheme is likely to increase our living expenses, I think it is well worthwhile. Measures need to be taken to minimise pollution in our environment. I think in the long-term the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will do just this.
- I am for it but can't comment further.
- I am very concerned about the situation of the world right now, and I think that it will be a problem for the younger generations if nothing is done about it. I think the Emissions Trading Scheme is a good idea.
- I think everything must be at least tried and as soon as possible.
- The Emissions Trading Scheme is a good idea however I haven't read the Green Paper. We have to start somewhere and I think this is a good place to start.

Support but I need more information

- Having not read the Green Paper I know nothing about it but I agree that something has to be done.
- I am in favour of the Emissions Trading Scheme but I don't know enough about it to discuss it or give an opinion.

Supportive but it's a bit late

- I think it is all happening for the better but it's 10 years too late.

Costs will force community to conserve energy/usage

- Electricity is currently under priced. If it cost more users would consume it more wisely. And the extra money could be spent on research.

General negative to ETS

General negative to ETS

- I definitely do not want an Emissions Trading Scheme.
- I don't believe that there should be a Carbon Trading Scheme at all.
- I reckon the idea is a licence to print money for those with entrepreneurial skills. It is a waste of money. Those in control of this concept are complete idiots.
- I think that it's not going to help anybody. It is a typical Government initiative, just like they have taken the lead out of petrol and we still pay more. Build a dam and concrete the lot of it.
- It does not matter what consultation there is, the Government will do what they plan anyway.
- This is a total load of crap. This will only benefit the Government and the major emission contributors. Pipe the emissions out to the oil wells to be mixed with other products to produce commercial gas and LPG.

ETS equals right to pollute

- The thing that puzzles me is that we seem to be selling the rights to pollute.
- It is a licence for rich industry to pollute. Asian imports will replace Australian manufacturing resulting in greater pollution in the long run.

Need more research to reduce emissions

Need more research to reduce emissions

- A lot more research is needed into reducing emissions. I don't think anyone knows the answers.
- I believe they need to invest in further research to solve the problem of carbon emissions.
- Not enough research has been done.

Greenhouse effect is a cyclical issue

- I believe climate change has been going on for years and isn't a modern problem.
- I do not believe we should have an ETS. I don't believe we are suffering from greenhouse effects. Similar conditions prevailed only 600 years ago. It is just a cycle, a natural phenomena.
- I think they should study more about all this greenhouse emissions and global warming as I believe everything goes in cycles.

ETS money to be used for research and development

- I think the Government should put the money generated from the Emissions Trading Scheme into researching and advancing renewable energy.

Good concept but process/implementation needs research

Good concept but process/implementation needs research

- The aim is right, it is just the steps are rather drastic.
- The ETS is being implemented too quickly. It needs a lot more research done. The concept of an ETS is good but more research into the effect it will have on the Australian economy compared to other countries who are much higher polluters of the globe.
- There needs to be a lot more research done before they introduce such a scheme.
- There's not enough research gone into this scheme.
- We just need to do more research before we jump the gun and begin something we know little about.

ETS is only a short-term solution

- The Emissions Trading Scheme is a short term and political solution to a much bigger problem. Lots more research is imperative.

Neutral comment

Neutral comment

- I own a modern motor car which takes 90% unleaded petrol and 10% E10. Yet, living in country Victoria I am unable to take advantage of this and reduce the emissions my car puts out as E10 is not available. It's only available at city service stations.

- I'm just very glad to see that someone is finally doing something about our environment and action is being taken.
- Research into global cooling is now proving it to be more destructive than global warming.
- They must remember that some of the carbon emissions are caused from natural causes such as volcanoes erupting.

Improve environmental and sustainable practices

Improve environmental and sustainable practices

- Everyone should be encouraged to look at ways of reducing their emissions.

Preserve the environment and forest, etc.

- I think there should be a lot more done about preserving forests and trees in general. It is a well known fact that trees soak up carbon emissions. Native forests are sacrificed for pine trees which are harvested and it takes years for re-growth.

Environmentally friendly buildings/houses/manufacturing

- I would like to see assistance to helping people with lower incomes make their homes more environmentally friendly to help with emissions.

Go ahead/no other option

Go ahead/no other option

- I just think it is the way we have to go.

Follow international standards

- We need to follow international standards and not go out on our own.

Appendix 4: Business Comments

Not aware of it/Need more information

Not aware of it/Need more information

- More consultation with everyone involved.
- I do not know about the Green Paper.
- The community has had nothing explained.
- We need to have more information. Nothing seems to be out there for the community or business to learn or know much about it.
- We need to be more informed.
- Not really, but where is this Green Paper?
- Not enough public consultation.
- Not enough information has been given to us. A brief outline of main points should be mailed to us on recycled paper with the opportunity to return it with comments and suggestions. Should be written so that it's easily understood.
- Not aware of Green Paper. I think the public need to know more about the whole thing. Perhaps the TV would be a good medium.
- No, I haven't read enough about it.
- No, I'm not into it too much at this stage.
- More information needs to be given to the community.
- More information is needed.
- Know hardly anything of these matters but I guess I should as it probably effects me in the long run.
- I would like to see the Green Paper.
- I would like more information, especially what is in this Green Paper.
- I think that more education is needed on this topic. Businesses need to be educated and consulted before this is put in place.
- I really don't know anything about this and should perhaps find out more.
- I haven't read it so can't comment on it.
- I have not read the report but would like to know the detail of it.
- I have not read enough about any of this.
- I have not heard of this Green Paper or Emissions Scheme at all.
- I have not heard of the Green Paper or these Emission Trading Schemes.
- I don't think there is a great deal of community awareness about the Emissions Trading Scheme. There also has not been enough community consultation.
- I don't know enough.
- I do not know enough on any of this. I think that would be the general opinion of the community.
- I do not know enough about this to make an informed decision.
- I do not have any knowledge of this Green Paper. I read the daily newspaper and local papers and listen to the news on TV and have not seen or heard a thing about it.
- I cannot comment because I do not know anything about this.
- Do not know enough about it to really give an opinion. There needs to be more information out there for the community in general.
- Do not know enough about it to comment adequately.

Lack of understanding of what effects it will have

- I do not know the implications of this Green Paper.
- The introduction of an ETS is not well understood or defined at this stage. The general public must be informed of the personal as well as the business impact of having an ETS.
- I don't think there's been enough discussion or research into it and the long term effect on the Latrobe Valley and jobs.
- I do not have enough information for knowledge on this matter, but I think in the short term it will effect us a lot but in the long term we need to do something.
- I think it needs more consultation, particularly, if it's going to affect the economic environment.
- It is very hard for ordinary people to understand, perhaps there needs to be a community consultation to explain it in more detail about the effects and costs involved.
- It is hard to know the effect of this Emissions Trading Scheme without more knowledge of how it will work, if at all.
- I work in the power industry and do not believe the community understands carbon emission or the cost of doing something about it. Knowledge and information on the ramifications of the methods of clean power and real figures on costs need to be given.

- I do not know anything about this Green Paper or Emissions Trading Scheme. I have seen something on TV but do not understand what it is all about.
- I am not aware of the full implications of any of this.
- It would affect everyone differently. However, if peoples jobs are at risk it needs to be made more clear before it is enforced.
- More effort needs to be made to ensure that the business community has a clearer understanding of the proposed Emissions Trading Scheme and the costs involved.

Don't understand it/confused

- Put it in 'every day language' that everyone can understand. No one has explained how it works to the lay person.
- There is a lot of uncertainty about the Emissions Trading Scheme.
- The Emissions Trading Scheme is a difficult concept to understand. We need more explanation on how an Emissions Trading Scheme operates.
- I do not understand it. I am sure there are a lot of people in the same boat.
- I believe it needs to be simplified and clearly laid out in laymans terms.

Where does the money go/how will it be used

- How do you know that the money is going where they say? Is it being off-set, where's the proof?

Economic Impact - Negative

Detrimental to Australian/local economy

- It will cost us all. Something needs to be done but the right way.
- I think the scheme is ludicrous and very crazy. It will put us further into the recession and create economic disaster.
- It will effect everything. It will all cost more. There needs to be some trade off as well. If it only is Australia we will become less competitive with the rest of the world.
- Any cost created by an ETS should be passed onto China/India, etc., through an increase in exporting. This could then be passed back through subsidies to companies affected. It would lessen the region's impact both financially and in the labour market.
- There's clean coal and many other areas to think about because it will impact on jobs.
- It needs to consider the impact on Australia and Victoria's economy and therefore peoples' standards of living.
- Some effort needs to be made to ensure that businesses have a soft landing and that costs are not mainly met by one area of business.
- Power stations are cutting back on spending awaiting the outcome if this Emissions Trading Scheme. Major works which effect my business are put on hold. This has a domino effect on small business.

Increased costs/another tax

- Sadly, it is not the high paid political leaders who will suffer, it is the little people who are not fully aware what it is until it's too late and their taxes and bills have increased.
- I work for the power companies and understand how it works. It's going to be very expensive for the power companies to survive. Consequently, it will force them to increase electricity costs. How is the average household or pensioner going to cope?
- Apart from my business costs, my concern is also with potential increased domestic energy costs.
- Everyone will pay with more taxes on coal, electricity and everything.
- Unfortunately, there will be economic implications and pain for the general population.
- Suddenly more interest in media re public transport, hybrid vehicles, etc. It's just another form of carbon tax - simpler way to go.

Small business will suffer

- ETS will have a huge negative impact on local economy. Small business will suffer, but the large ones will buy out.
- We do need to do something to help the environment but steam-rolling costs applied to small businesses need to be subsidised.
- Life is already pretty hard and I hope they do their research before small businesses are pushed to the extreme.

Rewards/compensation for those who reduce pollution (carbon credits)

- It would be nice to have strategies to reduce pollution. Rewards should be given to businesses who reduce pollution.

- I'd like to see more done on carbon credits. I planted 3000 trees 10 years ago hoping to help the environment and make an income from selling carbon credits - still hasn't happened. Spent \$6000 couldn't claim it on tax, and can't earn carbon credits.

Large industry/Government are the only ones to gain

- All the emissions control is very costly. When things go wrong there is such a long down time. You need lots of trade experience. Business who can afford it will comply.

Needs to be global approach

Negative ETS but global approach

- The Federal Government is hell bent on jumping feet first when we are a small scale polluter on the world scene. If the other countries aren't going to get involved we shouldn't. It will seriously disadvantage us economically.

It is a global issue

- We need to get the rest of the world in line. We only create 1% so we are really not solving the world's problem. We should be on a level playing field.
- There needs to be more meetings worldwide to consult with other countries so that everyone is 'on the bus' to reduce emissions globally.
- I think the philosophy is great but major contributors need to be onboard from the outset. I feel that all countries should take responsibility, but that poorer countries shouldn't be expected to participate without assistance from richer countries.
- Australia should tax other countries who we deal with in regard to the import trade for their lack of contributing to similar Emissions Trading Schemes and control of emissions in their country.
- Unless all the other countries are on board it seems pointless for us to rush into it.
- The Government needs to be certain that it is actually going to make a difference globally.

Australian emissions are minor compared to other countries

- Compared to the rest of the world, Australia is leading the fight against it. Everyone needs to do the same.
- Why should Australia be leading the way when other places do nothing? We keep planting trees and doing lots to compensate for these other heavy polluters of the globe.
- I don't see why Australia should be introducing this when China and India are not doing it. Australia's carbon emissions are a drop in the ocean compared to that of many other countries.
- China pumps out so much emission rubbish. Australia's little bit means nothing in comparison but in the long term something needs to be done by everyone.
- Australia should not be going down that track alone. Our difference would be negligible if other countries are not doing the same. It will prove to be a waste of tax payers money.
- Australia only contributes 1.4%. Doing our bit will not solve the world problems, it will only create high unemployment for us.
- 1.4% emissions in Australia compared to other countries is minimal.

Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it

Green Paper/ETS - not enough thought has gone into it

- I think they haven't thought about the consequences.
- I think they are jumping in too heavy. There are other more simpler things they could be doing first.
- I think it has been rushed unnecessarily.
- I can't see why the Government has to jump in straight away.

Lacks common sense/it won't work

- It's the wrong way to go at this stage.
- If, as I understand it, your carbon emission credits are more than what you use, then you can sell your excess credits to others. If this is correct then we are saving nothing and defeating the purpose. How is it going to work?

Only one point of view / propaganda

- It's Government propaganda to introduce the concept.
- The green paper has been written by an environmentalist - only one point of view.
- How can you trade on something you can't measure? This is a whole lot of garbage. They plant trees for carbon credit, and then they chop them down to make paper! It all depends on which barrow you're pushing.

Complicated document

- Not certain it's the way to go. Overly complicated - recent petrol price increase had more affect.

Decision is already made / done deal

- Government tend to go for what they want now but do not think of the consequences down the track.
- I think they are going to do this regardless of community support or lack of it. Mr Rudd has made his decision already.
- I am of the understanding that the Government has already signed off on the Emissions Trading Scheme, therefore any input businesses and the community have is really not relevant and will have no impact on the decision. It has already happened.

Use or find alternative solutions/power source

Use or find alternative solutions/power source

- We rely on coal too much in this area without the need or necessity to look at alternatives.

Alternative energy/power source

- I think we should stop burning the brown coal.
- I don't think it's a good idea. Don't tax it. Let's insist people install water tanks and solar electricity. This would have a far more positive affect on reducing Carbon Emissions and helping the environment.
- I'd just like to say that as far as the Latrobe Valley goes, research should be undertaken into new and cleaner technology to use brown coal as Gippsland supplies over 80% of this countries electricity.
- We must engage new technology which is already available and improve the management of power stations.

Clean up the coal industry

- Need to put more time and effort into working out clean energy. We are not utilising what we have and what we know efficiently.
- They shouldn't be spending any more money looking for new power. Our fuel and electricity bills are no cheaper. They should reduce the cost of our current power.
- There is no such thing as 'clean coal'.
- The opportunities for clean coal technology and alternative uses for coal offer potential growth for this area. It does, however require a significant amount of research and time.
- According to a leading engineer friend, who specialises in coal research, we can have zero emissions if we are prepared to pay the costs.
- We have the coal to use but have to be smarter using it. Government bodies contribute a lot to emissions.
- Clean coal technology is not too far away.

All industries to clean up their act

- All industry should clean up their act and stop the emissions so that they do not have to trade it off.

General supportive of ETS

General supportive of ETS

- It's about time someone has taken a stand.
- Overall I am in favour of it. It has to start somewhere. Let's lead the way even though we are not big polluters. Maybe we can get other countries started.
- It needs to happen.
- I think it's better to deal with detrimental effects in the short term so that we may experience a better existence in the long term.
- Obviously something like this has to go ahead in one way or another for the future.

Supportive but it's a bit late

- I would like to say that saving this earth and looking after it has to be more important than economics. We are probably already too late to make a big enough difference but we do need to start somewhere.

Improve environmental and sustainable practices

Preserve the environment and forest, etc.

- We should do what we can to reduce emissions. There are lots of things we can do that don't cost much ie. there's got to be a better way to manage our forests. Instead of burn offs, why not use cattle instead?
- I'm disappointed that they allow bush clearing still if they are so concerned about the greenhouse effects.
- I'm a conservationist but trees must be replanted to reduce pollution in the air. You can't clear millions of trees and expect the environment to remain the same.

Environmentally friendly buildings/houses/manufacturing

- Just another tax which would make Australia uncompetitive. It will cost jobs in the long term.
- I feel the money that is being spent on this could be better spent. The Government could subsidise the car industry by investing in an affordable hybrid car for the low income earners. It would also encourage people to update their cars regularly.

Water is a higher priority

- I think water is more important for the future and new dams are a bigger issue for years to come.

Good concept but process/implementation needs research

Good concept but process/implementation needs research

- My impression is that a lot more research needs to be done.
- I feel more research needs to be done before it is implemented.

Dependant on how it is implemented

- I believe it needs to be balanced and to be introduced within a proper time frame.
- Effects is all dependant on how it is implemented and then the flow-on costs to businesses and the community.

It needs a realistic timeframe for implementation

- While technology improvements are a key to achieving pollution reduction, a realistic timeframe to implement these new technologies must be a key consideration.

Go ahead/no other option

Go ahead/no other option

- I think it's a good thing and has to come in. Whether Australia takes the initiative and introduces it first, I think we should all support it.

Proceed with caution

- Proceed with caution
- I don't accept that it will be a major impact to our economy. The coal of this area will continue to be extracted for a long time to come as it is in demand. The carbon is a problem but I can't see us stopping the mining so this tax needs to be gradual.

Businesses to take a positive approach to this

- There should be positive action taken by industry so they comprehend it and new industry investment takes place. Shouldn't be a doomsday approach. Any action needs to be positive.

General negative to ETS

General negative to ETS

- I believe it is a big scam.
- I'd like to know where they get all their facts from. I'm not 100% confident that there is a legitimate reason to be increasing household and business costs when scientists all have differing views on climate change and its affect on the environment.

ETS equals right to pollute

- The scheme does not allow for a reduction in pollution it really only gives current polluters permission to continue polluting.

Need more research to reduce emissions

Need more research to reduce emissions

- I think more research is needed into these areas.
- More research is needed in that situation.

Neutral comment

Neutral comment

- Anything I have to say would be insignificant.