

Submission to

Committee Secretary
Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

Phone: (02) 6277 4587
Fax: (02) 6277 4774
email: jscacefl@aph.gov.au

Submission from:

Mr Richard Davis

To the Committee:

There are several reasons the 'Clean Energy Future' legislation and associated 'Carbon Tax' are bad for Australia and this policy should be abandoned immediately:

1. The 'Clean Energy future' is a mirage. The CO2 price required to make renewable energy competitive with coal is estimated at \$50-\$70 per tonne, and will not be reached until approximately 2033 under the heroic 'medium global action' scenario modelled by Treasury. This level will be required to provide a 'price signal' to local power generators. The \$23 per tonne figure will provide no incentive to shift to renewable energy sources, and will result in a business as usual approach to local industry, with offsets bought on the international market and prices passed onto consumers. Australia will remain a 'dirty' economy until at least 2033.
2. There is no compensation for the ETS component of the scheme. The Compensation for the \$23 per tonne price may or may not be adequate, but there is no compensation for the \$29 per tonne estimated in 2020 or the higher prices estimated by Treasury thereafter. Therefore this scheme will increase the taxation burden on Australians and reduce the disposable incomes of all Australians.
3. There is no environmental benefit. Even accepting the most shrill claims of Greenpeace, The Greens or the IPCC, reducing Australia's emissions to 0 would cause no noticeable change in the forecast warming.
4. Treasury modelling is makes unfounded assumptions about the existence of 'Coal Capture and Storage' technology.
5. Treasury modelling makes heroic assumption of a global carbon price in 2015 or thereabouts, which is unlikely.

(<http://www.treasury.gov.au/carbonpricemodelling/content/report/07chapter3.asp>)

6. Chart 4.4: Multi-stage emission allocations for the CPRS-5 scenario
(http://www.treasury.gov.au/lowpollutionfuture/report/html/04_Chapter4.asp) projections are laughable, and show China's emissions dropping from 2015, this is ridiculous.
7. The science of global warming is based on probabilistic arguments mistaking correlation for causation, and despite the claims of advocates, is unlikely to withstand scrutiny.
8. There has been a 10 year 'hiatus' in warming since 1998 according to peer reviewed science. This was unexpected and casts doubt on the theory. See *'Reconciling anthropogenic climate change with observed temperature 1998–2008'*; Robert K. Kaufmann¹, Heikki Kauppi^b, Michael L. Manna, and James H. Stock^c, 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1102467108 PNAS July 5, 2011 and *'Model-based evidence of deep-ocean heat uptake during surface-temperature hiatus periods'*; Gerald A. Meehl¹, Julie M. Arblaster^{1, 2}, John T. Fasullo¹, Aixue Hu¹ & Kevin E. Trenberth¹ Nature Climate Change (2011) DOI:10.1038/nclimate1229

Thank you for considering my submission.