

To reduce the inequity between state and private schools do you think the mandate that spends somewhere between 16 cents and 25 cents of every dollar spent in NSW schools must also be handed to private schools should be abolished?

The state's 79 wealthiest private schools receive more than \$65 million state subsidies each year, on top of the very generous \$141 million from the Commonwealth. This includes elite schools like Kings, Ascham, Moriah and Knox. The Greens would remove funding from the richest private schools which would still operate at luxury levels without it. The money saved would employ more than 2,000 additional teachers in NSW public schools that serve disadvantaged communities.

Andrew Constance (MNH letters last week) falsely claimed that The Greens want to close non-government schools, including local catholic schools. He is wrong. No independent or Catholic school would need to close down because of Greens policies.

The Greens want substantial increases in public education funding, to be used:

- to reduce class sizes in years 3 to 12,
- provide universal public preschool education,
- increase resources for children with special needs (more support for integration, more placements),
- allocate more for public schools that serve disadvantaged communities, and
- substantially increase teacher pay and reduce face-to-face teaching loads.

It costs about \$95,000 to employ a teacher in a public school for a year and about \$100,000 to keep an adult male in jail for a year. If each additional teacher provides just one young person with sufficient self-confidence and belief in themselves and the society they will live in to keep them out of jail, then they will easily pay their way in avoided incarceration costs.

Do you support the proposed tax on carbon emissions? Who should be compensated - residents (and if so would that be means tested,) or business, or both?

The Greens support a carbon tax. Pricing carbon is the first step towards reducing our reliance on polluting fossil fuels and creating a safe climate future.

A proposal for a carbon tax evoked some hysterical comments from coalition politicians and their supporters last week, even death threats against MPs who supported it. Most of these assume that climate change will be cost free. It won't be costless and it will have a human face. The longer we leave it, the more it will cost.

We can and should compensate people for the impacts of a carbon price, but we cannot compensate for the impacts of climate change.

Integral to The Greens commitment to a carbon tax is compensation, targeted to the lowest income households and for trade exposed industries, including steel - for their disadvantage relative to foreign competitors which face lower carbon prices.

Australian governments hand out over \$11 billion in subsidies from the taxpayer to fossil fuel companies every year. This must stop if we are serious about stopping a climate crisis.

Under models for pricing carbon currently being considered, the Eden woodchipping industry will get off scot free.

While The Greens do not believe that native forest carbon would ideally be included in an emissions trading scheme, if the woodchipping industry were to pay \$20 a tonne, the carbon price proposed by Professor Garnaut, for the carbon that logging and woodchipping releases into the atmosphere, it would pay \$1 million a day. Other mechanisms are more suitable for dealing with carbon released by forest degradation and destruction.

(No more than 300 words on each question answers back by Friday 4pm)