

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE INQUIRY ON CLIMATE POLICY

Summary

This submission mainly addresses part '(l) any related matter' of the Senate Committee terms of reference

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) policy has serious deficiencies, which need to be addressed by the Senate Committee.

The CPRS Bill title and part (a) of the Senate Committee terms of reference give the misleading impression that they deal with the reduction of carbon pollution instead of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions. There appears to be no logical reason for this, other than a deliberate attempt to misinform the electorate and political representatives.

As climate change is ongoing, the Senate Committee should define specifically what is meant by the term 'climate change' in the terms of reference, so that the objective of the climate policy is clearly understood.

The terms of reference make no mention of climate science. Notwithstanding, as there is no convincing evidence to conclude that the science is settled, the Senate Committee must examine the validity of the alleged scientific justification for the CPRS.

The CPRS policy is dependent on the belief that greenhouse gas emissions are causing harmful effects on the climate. This belief derives from environmentalist action in the late 1970s to promote the greenhouse theory. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was set up in 1988 with the primary objective of assessing available scientific information on climate change, so as to prepare for launching of the greenhouse theory at the 1992 'Earth Summit' in Rio. This resulted in the 1992 Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), which came into force in 1994 and initiated a system for compulsory reduction of greenhouse gases by signatory Governments. The procedure has been implemented by a series of 'Conferences of the Parties' (COP), the next one being COP15 which will take place in Copenhagen in 2009.

The IPCC participating scientists are mainly Government employees, or recipients of Government finance, and all of the Working Group members tend to be supporters of the greenhouse theory. Consequently, there was never any intention to provide a balanced, or an unbiased scientific assessment of climate science.

The IPCC Reports have all been prepared in order to influence the successive COP meetings. So as to assert man-made global warming, these reports have been tainted with essentially false statements, e.g. the inclusion of a special aerosol factor (later abandoned in the 2001 Report) to explain a cooling trend from 1940 to 1975, in the 1990 Report; the deletion of a key consulting scientific reviewer approved statement, "none of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed climate changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases" from the final draft of the 1995 Report, and the insertion in its place of strong endorsements of man-made warming; the inclusion in the 1995 Report of a 1000-year climate history graph showing a warm period from 1000 to 1400 AD with warmer temperatures than today, and its replacement in the 2001 Report with a hockey-stick shaped graph (subsequently

shown to be erroneous) showing 900 years of stable global temperatures until about 1910 and then sharply rising temperatures thereafter.

It is ironical that the climate science statement reversal in the IPCC 1995 Report, which falsely suggested that the science was settled, led to the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997.

Given that the IPCC has been studying the subject for 20 years, it is surprising that the strongest endorsement that the IPCC can give in its 2007 Report, is: "Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperature since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations".

The alarmist climate change projections that are made by the IPCC and quoted widely in the media, are derived with the use of computer climate models and scenarios of what might happen in the future. It is pertinent that none of these models has ever been validated. Consequently, its models cannot be relied on for prediction purposes, and the projections can be regarded only as speculative.

Climate science is not settled. The available observations do not support the mathematical models that predict a substantial global warming and form the basis for a control policy on greenhouse gas emissions. Whereas CO2 emissions have continued to increase, global temperatures have not risen in the past 10 years. In fact, there is no convincing scientific evidence that global warming or climate change is man-caused.

Climate history observations point to global warming being a natural process, with celestial phenomena being the principal driver of climate. There is considerable evidence of 1,500 year climate cycles, and that this is responsible for most of the Earth's warming since 1850. Solar variability is considered as the leading hypothesis to explain the roughly 1,500-year oscillation of the climate since the last Ice Age.

Having been subjected to 20 years of climate change propaganda from the IPCC, the media and school educators, and the extreme alarmism of Al Gore, Australians have been conditioned to believe in man-caused global warming. Therefore, it is not surprising that Australians generally are misinformed about it. The political parties have been opportunistic in exploiting this misinformation of constituents by proposing greenhouse gas reduction policies. It is in the national interest that the Senate Committee acknowledges this parlous situation in which the CPRS Bill effectively panders to the misinformed, and therefore recommends that the climate science evidence be reviewed before the Bill is considered by the House of Representatives.

There is inadequate information about the impact of CPRS implementation on technology development, industry restructuring, and the standard of living. Because of the substantial impact that implementation of a CPRS would have on the Australian economy, rigorous and rational examination of all these areas is essential before a Parliamentary decision on an ETS or any other CO2 taxing scheme is taken. Given that there are so many unknowns on the technology and economic fronts, it is considered imperative that proper cost-benefit analysis of alternative options is carried out and published for public scrutiny. Each of those cost-benefit analyses should spell out the post-implementation impacts on investment, prices, economic growth, trade and employment over at least the first 10 years.

However, as discussed elsewhere in this submission, global warming, if any, is due to natural processes, and consequently there is no valid rationale for proceeding with the implementation of a CPRS. It follows that it is in the national interest to adopt a do-nothing policy and adapt to whatever global warming eventuates. To do otherwise would be an absolute waste of resources, and would cause irreparable economic damage in the process.

See following pages for detailed discussion of:

1. Misleading CPRS Bill Title and Terms of Reference
2. The policy rationale is based on misinformation
 - (a) Greenhouse theory origin and promotion
 - (b) IPCC's false evidence of man-made warming
 - . the sulfate aerosol factor
 - . 'discernible human influence' controversy
 - . 'hockey stick' scandal
 - . 2007 IPCC Assessment Report
 - . IPCC Special Report on Emissions Scenarios 2000
 - . IPCC lack of integrity
 - (c) Misinforming role of media
 - (d) Science not settled
 - (e) False claims of climate change effects
 - (f) Effect of carbon reduction policy implementation
3. Sources

1. Misleading CPRS Bill Title and Terms of Reference

The title of the Bill, 'Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme', is misleading. The Bill is neither about carbon nor pollution. It is aimed at man-induced CO₂ emissions and their potential effect on climate. Carbon dioxide is an invisible gas, which is an essential nutrient for plants. (Researchers have proven that higher CO₂ concentrations enable plants to grow faster and give them better drought tolerance. (1))

As Australian environmental scientist, Bob Carter, pointed out the scientific errors in the 'carbon pollution reduction' naming as far back as July 2008 (2), when the Green Paper was released, it suggests that this has been done deliberately, so as to mislead the misinformed and uninformed into believing that the aim of the so-called scheme is to reduce carbon pollution, and thus be regarded as beneficial in that context.

For the reasons given above, reference to 'carbon pollution reduction' in part (a) of the terms of reference suggests that the Senate Committee aims to misinform. If this is not the case, the Senate Committee should acknowledge the error and explain what was intended.

Part (b) erroneously refers to 'carbon stores'. Presumably, it should be referring to CO₂ absorption by plants and trees and their consequential release of oxygen.

As climate change is ongoing, the Senate Committee should define specifically what is meant by the term 'climate change' in the terms of reference, so that the objective of the climate policy is clearly understood.

Other deficiencies in the terms of reference include omitting to question the derivation and validity of the alleged scientific justification for such a scheme; failure to address the adverse impact on existing industry structure, employment

and living standards; and overlooking the need for cost-benefit analysis to justify proceeding with the scheme.

2. The policy rationale is based on misinformation

The policy for applying tax measures to reduce production of CO₂ emissions is based on the IPCC and environmental activist claims that such emissions cause global warming. These claims cannot be substantiated for the reasons given below.

(a) Greenhouse theory origin and promotion

According to perennial expert reviewer of IPCC Assessment Reports, Dr Vincent Gray:

"In the late 1970s the environmental movement began to adopt the theory that emissions of 'greenhouse gases' were destroying the earth by causing 'global warming'. This theory had been promoted without success twice before.

The first was by the Swedish chemist, Svante Arrhenius, in 1895. He failed because the earth cooled for the subsequent 15 years, and then was embroiled in two world wars and an economic crisis. Guy Stewart Callendar revised this theory in 1938. He also failed because the earth cooled, this time for the subsequent 36 years.

After this, one of the earth's natural cycles began to raise temperatures and the environmentalists took this as an opportunity to revive the greenhouse theory. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the 'Earth Summit' in Rio 3-14 June 1992 was organised to launch an attack on all forms of 'Development' on the grounds that they destroyed 'The Environment'. A major purpose of the Conference was to launch the greenhouse theory, once more, and this time to convert it into a weapon for a campaign to impoverish the world. ...

The IPCC was jointly set up by the World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environmental Program in 1988 to provide support for the forthcoming 1992 Earth Summit in its campaign to adopt the greenhouse theory.

The IPCC was set up In order to:

- Assess available scientific information on climate change: Working Group I;
- Assess the environmental and socio-economic impacts of climate change: Working Group II.
- Formulate response strategies: Working Group III.

The second and third objectives depend heavily on the first.

The three Working Groups are made up of nominees of the two sponsors and of the Governments that support the greenhouse theory. The scientists are mainly Government employees, or recipients of Government finance. As Governments throughout the world have come to adopt policies dependent on the belief that greenhouse gas emissions are causing harmful effects on the climate, all of the Working Group members tend to be supporters of this view as are the 'Lead Authors' of the Reports who are nominated by them. ...

The 'Earth Summit' resulted in the 1992 Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), adopted on 9 May 1992. It came into force on 21 March 1994. By that time there were 166 signatures from National Governments. This Convention

initiated a system for compulsory reduction of greenhouse gases by 'Annex I' Governments, which has become progressive to the extent that it is now causing major economic disaster in many countries.

The procedure has been implemented by a series of 'Conferences of the Parties' ((COP 1,2,3, etc), in the different major cities of the world, including subsidiary meetings for implementation of the other campaigns of the environmental movement. These meetings have now reached COP15 which will take place in Copenhagen in 2009.

The IPCC Reports are a major contribution to the progress of the increasing restrictions on economic activity resulting from the main COP meetings, and their Reports have all been prepared in order to influence the successive meetings.

The FCCC defined 'Climate Change' in Article 1 as follows:
'a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.'

This statement is legally binding on the Governments who signed the Convention. It amounts to an assertion that all 'change' in the climate is caused by human emissions of greenhouse gases, even when it is only 'attributed, directly or indirectly', and that 'change of climate' that is 'natural' is mere 'variability'.

It provides a licence for the wholesale distortion of climate science carried out by the IPCC in its many publications." (3)

As Gray states, "The whole IPCC exercise was set up in order to accumulate 'evidence' that the 'globe' is undergoing 'global warming' as a result of increases in CO₂ and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. There was never any intention to provide a balanced, or an unbiased scientific assessment of climate science.

From the beginning, there have been scientists who disagreed with the theory that increases in greenhouse gases are harmful, but their views have not been included in the IPCC Reports and comments made by them have been comprehensively rejected, to the extent that few now bother to comment at all. Some recognised experts have resigned or expressed their opposition to the entire exercise." (4)

(b) IPCC's false evidence of man-made warming

US climate scientists, S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery, state that "one of the most serious problems in the public discussion of global warming is that alarmism has been promoted by essentially false statements from the IPCC". (5)

The Sulfate Aerosol Factor

Singer and Avery point out that the IPCC's First Assessment Report published in 1990 claimed that computerised global climate models showed a warming trend "broadly consistent" with real-world observations. But the real-world observations were of a slow erratic modern warming that started too early to be blamed on man-caused CO₂ emissions, namely a temperature surge from 1850 to 1870 and another from 1916 to 1940, then followed by a cooling trend from 1940 to 1975 which the IPCC could not explain. To cover itself, the IPCC introduced a cooling factor to the greenhouse analysis, claiming that tiny aerosol particles produced by

emissions of sulphur dioxide from electric power plants had overwhelmed the warming effect of rising CO₂ levels.

The second IPCC report, *Climate Change 1995*, again invoked the sulfate aerosol effect, and stated in its summary that "the balance of evidence suggests a human effect on climate."

However, the sulfate aerosol factor was abandoned in the third IPCC report, published in 2001, when it became evident that the highest rate of warming in the most recent 25 years had occurred in northern mid-latitudes, just where most aerosols are emitted. The third IPCC report published in 2001 kept its preconceived conclusion that "new evidence" made it likely that "most of the warming of the past 50 years" came from the human production of greenhouse gases.

'Discernible Human Influence' Controversy

For the second IPCC report, *Climate Change 1995*, the IPCC compared the detailed geographic patterns of climate change with the calculations of the climate models for the period 1905 to 1995. But correspondence appeared only for the time interval 1943 to 1970, not for the warming period from 1916 to 1940, nor for more recent decades. The draft of the report which had been approved by consulting scientific reviewers in late 1995, stated that "none of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed climate changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases... While some of the pattern-base studies discussed here have claimed detection of a significant climate change, no study to date has positively attributed all or part of the climate change observed to man-made causes. Nor has any study quantified the magnitude of a greenhouse gas effect or aerosol effect in the observed data – an issue of primary relevance to policy makers".

However, after the printed report appeared in May 1996, the scientific reviewers discovered that major changes had been made "in the back room" after they had signed off on the science chapter's (chapter 8's) contents. Despite the shortcomings of the scientific evidence, Ben Santer, the IPCC-appointed lead author of chapter 8, had deleted the key statements referred to in the paragraph above, and inserted strong endorsements of man-made warming in chapter 8, viz. "there is evidence of an emerging pattern of climate response to forcing by greenhouse gases and sulfate aerosols ... from the geographical, seasonal and vertical patterns of temperature change ... These results point toward a human influence on global climate. The body of statistical evidence in chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points to a discernible human influence on the global climate."

Singer and Avery state that the representatives of 96 nations and 14 non-government organisations (NGOs) who attended the IPCC Working Group I Plenary, a political meeting held in Madrid in November 1995, had gone over the "accepted" draft of *Climate Change 1995* line by line and forced the lead author of chapter 8 to make the unsupported revisions to accord with the global warming campaign being waged by the UN, the NGOs and the Clinton Administration.

'Hockey Stick' Scandal

The IPCC's second report, *Climate Change 1995*, included a graph of the past 1,000 years of climate history showing the historical picture of Earth's recent climate variability. It showed a Medieval Warm Period (from about 1000 AD to

about 1400 AD) with warmer temperatures than today, and a Little Ice Age (from about 1400 AD to about 1900 AD) with temperatures lower than today. In its third report, issued in 2001, the IPCC vigorously promoted a radically different picture of the Earth's last 1,000 climate years. The difficult-to-explain Medieval Warming and the awkward Little Ice Age had been replaced by 900 years of stable global temperatures until about 1910. Then the 20th century's temperatures were shown as rocketing upwards out of control, giving a graph with a shape resembling a hockey stick. Based on an analysis of proxy data, it was used to claim that the 20th century was the warmest in the past 1000 years. This claim was meant to suggest that the warming of the twentieth century was due to human causes, specifically the growth in atmospheric greenhouse gases. In fact, it has since been demonstrated that the hockey stick result was based on the faulty application of statistical analysis and the consequence of an incorrect procedure. Furthermore, additional proxy data that had not been considered by the hockey stick team, or by the IPCC, suggest that the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) was warmer than the twentieth century-- a conclusion in good accord with historic data such as settlement of Greenland.

As Singer and Avery observe, the lead author of chapter 8 of *Climate Change 1995*, had single-handedly reversed the "climate science" of the whole IPCC report – and with it the global warming political process. The second IPCC report, falsely suggesting that the science is settled, led to the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997.

The Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement ostensibly intended to limit the use of fossil-based energy, requires developed countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to 5.2% below 1990 levels by 2012. Nowhere in the Kyoto Protocol is there any statement of what greenhouse gas levels might be dangerous to either humans or the environment, nor how. Singer and Avery report that the UN's 'evidence' for human-induced warming was limited essentially to repeating the mantra that "the earth has warmed 0.6 degrees centigrade in the last century, reciting the greenhouse theory, and offering printouts from complex but unvalidated computer models".

2007 IPCC Assessment Report

The key claim of the fourth IPCC assessment report, *Climate Change 2007*, is:

"Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperature since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations".

Gray states "this is a typical example of the technique they have used throughout.

The main 'observed' temperature records which disagree with their opinion are those from weather balloons, which begin in 1958 and those from satellites, which begin in 1978. So they eliminate them from consideration by selecting the only record showing an increase, the unreliable mean global surface temperature anomaly. Even this record shows only a fluctuation, with a fall from 1950 to 1976, a rise to 1998 and a fall since then. Yet this biased opinion is used as an excuse for depriving the world of cheap energy.

Then all this is merely *very likely*, based on the unsupported opinion of 'experts' with a conflict of interest, as they are paid to say so." (6)

IPCC Special Report on Emissions Scenarios 2000

The projections that are made by the IPCC and quoted widely in the media, are derived with the use of computer climate models, which have never been validated (7), and scenarios of what might happen in the future. Consequently, its models cannot be relied on for prediction purposes, and the projections can be judged only as speculative.

Gray comments on the report as follows:

"The Drafts of this Report were circulated only to economists and environmental activists. I can claim to have been the only scientist to have commented on the second draft, as its existence came to my notice and I was permitted to borrow the copy from the New Zealand Ministry of Environment. I had a deadline of only one week, but I made copious comments, most of which were, of course, rejected.

The 'projections' of the IPCC are a combination of computer climate models (which have never been validated) and 'scenarios' of what might happen in the future. There have now been three sets of these, the SA series from the First Report, the IS90 series from the 1992 Supplement Report, and now the SRES series which were launched by the 2000 Report ... which was prepared by a subcommittee of the WGIII (Impacts) committee of the IPCC. This committee was staffed mainly by environmental enthusiasts committed to exaggerate future change. Their Report was not circulated to scientists for comment, or to experienced professional economists, so its exaggerated 'projections' were imposed on the scientists of the 2001 and 2007 (Assessment) Reports in order to boost the 'projections' of those reports.

I can give a personal experience of how this happened. The First Draft of the 2001 Report had a maximum 'projected' global temperature rise for the year 2100 of 4°C. The next draft raised this to 5.8°C by inventing a new scenario (A1F1) and using many models, including a drastic one. The politicians must simply have issued a demand to do so." (8)

IPCC Lack of Integrity

The lack of integrity in the IPCC's scientific approach is confirmed in the following comment of IPCC Expert Reviewer, Dr Gray:

"I have been an 'Expert Reviewer' for the IPCC right from the start and I have submitted a very large number of comments on their drafts. ... Over the period I have made an intensive study of the data and procedures used by IPCC contributors throughout their whole study range. I have a large library of reprints, books and comments and have published many comments of my own in published papers, a book, and in my occasional Newsletter, the current number being 157.

I began with a belief in scientific ethics, that scientists would answer queries honestly, that scientific argument would take place purely on the basis of facts, logic and established scientific and mathematical principles.

Right from the beginning, I have had difficulty with this procedure. Penetrating questions often ended without any answer. Comments on the IPCC drafts were rejected without explanation, and attempts to pursue the matter were frustrated indefinitely.

Over the years, as I have learned more about the data and procedures of the IPCC, I have found increasing opposition by them to providing explanations, until I have been forced to the conclusion that for significant parts of the work of the IPCC, the data collection and scientific methods employed are unsound. Resistance to all efforts to try and discuss or rectify these problems has convinced me that normal scientific procedures are not only rejected by the IPCC, but that this practice is endemic, and was part of the organisation from the very beginning. I therefore consider that the IPCC is fundamentally corrupt. The only 'reform' I could envisage, would be its abolition." (9)

Further material that seriously questions the credibility and integrity of the IPCC's activities and claims may be found at <http://mclean.ch/climate/IPCC.htm> , which lists some 50 articles.

(c) Misinforming Role of Media

Twenty years of IPCC misrepresentation has influenced the media generally to believe in man-caused global warming. Consequently, the media are prejudiced in their reporting of the subject. Most mainstream journalists are committed to the environmental cause, as it gives them a continual source of alarming news for newspaper columns and TV news bulletins.

In particular, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) effectively has abandoned its impartiality reporting guidelines by unquestionably accepting that climate change, not just global warming, is man-caused. It regards belief in so-called man-caused climate change as politically correct. The ABC can be relied on to report on any story of alarmist projected consequences of increasing greenhouse gas emissions. However, instead of acting in the national interest by facilitating debate, the ABC rarely airs or reports opposing views about the subject. In applying this censorship, the ABC aligns itself with the alarmist climate change prejudice of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). Renowned British scientist, David Bellamy, who was making "loads of TV programs" with the BBC, was banished by the BBC after he made it known that he did not believe what he was being told about global warming. (10)

Government-owned broadcaster SBS takes a similar approach to the ABC.

The major Australian dailies, while mostly supportive of man-caused global warming, occasionally do publish articles by those holding opposing views.

Having been subjected to 20 years of climate change propaganda, including the extreme alarmism of Al Gore, Australians have been conditioned to believe in man-caused global warming. Therefore, it is not surprising that Australians generally, particularly the younger ones, are misinformed about it. In the case of younger Australians, the media reinforces the greenhouse theory promulgation to which they have been subjected during their school years, thanks to their teachers having been misinformed about the theory.

It is opportunistic that political parties have exploited this misinformation of constituents by proposing greenhouse gas reduction policies.

As US public policy analyst, Candace Crandall, observed, "Widespread distortion of scientific evidence, aided by scientific illiteracy among journalists and policymakers, has led to health and environmental policies that are increasingly driven by advocacy and activism, by emotion rather than by reason. Not surprisingly, more and more people are coming to the conclusion that US

environmental policies are wrong-headed, incredibly wasteful, at times counterproductive, and frequently enacted before we know if they will do any good—or even if the suspected problem is real. ... Policies driven by incomplete and misleading data simply waste scarce public resource." (11)

(d) Science not settled

Contrary to what the IPCC and environmental activists claim, climate science is not settled. As Singer points out, "it is both uncertain and incomplete. The available observations do not support the mathematical models that predict a substantial global warming and form the basis for a control policy on greenhouse gas emissions. We need a more targeted program of climate research to settle major scientific problems." (12) He maintains that the global warming issue should be considered 'unfinished business'.

Nor is there a scientific consensus that global warming or climate change is man-caused. Singer and Avery state that it is sheer fantasy to suggest that a huge majority of scientists with expertise in global climate change endorses an alarming interpretation of recent climate data. (13)

In May 2008, more than 31,000 US scientists with university degrees in science signed a petition rejecting claims of human-caused global warming. "Moreover, from the clear and strong petition statement that they have signed, it is evident that these 31,072 American scientists are not 'skeptics'."(14)

In fact, there is no convincing scientific evidence that global warming or climate change is man-caused.

Dr David Evans, a consultant to the Australian Greenhouse Office from 1999 to 2005, stated that "the world has spent \$50 billion on global warming since 1990, and we have not found any actual evidence that carbon emissions cause global warming ... Computer models and theoretical calculations are not evidence, they are just theory ..." (15)

It is notable that scientists, Hans Schreuder, Piers Corbyn, Dr Don Parkes and Svend Hendriksen, in April 2008 challenged the IPCC to retract support from the current IPCC position, and admit that there is no observational evidence in measured data going back 22,000 years that CO2 levels (whether from man or nature) have driven or are driving world temperatures or climate change. In particular, they drew attention to three observational refutations of the IPCC position:

Icecore data from the ACIA (Arctic Climate Impact Assessment) shows that temperatures have fallen since around 4,000 years ago (the Bronze Age Climate Optimum) while CO2 levels have risen, yet this graphical data was not included in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers (Fig. SPM1 Feb07) which graphed the CO2 rise;

. More recent data shows that world temperatures have not risen and indeed have fallen over the past 10 years while CO2 levels have risen;

. Contrary to the CO2 driver theory, temperatures in the upper troposphere (where most jets fly) have fallen over the past two decades.

They highlighted the fact that IPCC policy is already leading to economic and unintended environmental damage. Specifically, the policy of burning food – maize as biofuel – has contributed to sharp rises in food prices which are causing great hardship in many countries and is also now leading to increased deforestation in Brazil, Malaysia, Indonesia, Togo, Cambodia, Nigeria, Burundi, Sri Lanka, Benin and Uganda for cultivation of crops.(16)

Retired US research scientist, Dr Malcolm Ross, identified the Clinton administration's pursuit of policies aimed at curbing global warming as 'junk science'. He went on to say that "The idea that humans have significantly enhanced global warming is by far the most massive abuse of science that I ever have seen. The prediction of disastrous global warming is used to justify a policy of centralised control of the world's energy resources. Radical environmentalists believe that if the industrial nations do not reverse their economic growth they will destroy the Earth. Scientists who point out that recent measurements of actual temperatures do not indicate anything out of the ordinary—and plenty of scientists who have found this, are accused of being in the employ of greedy commercial interests. In fact, they are merely telling the truth. Those pushing the global warming—now called 'climate change'—agenda do not want to hear it... I am appalled at what I refer to as 'politically correct science.' Scientific investigation continually asks the question—is it true? The role of science is not only to discover new facts and phenomena, but to uncover errors appearing in previous investigations. Science is continually in the process of correcting previous work; no study is fixed forever in time."(17)

Climate history observations strongly suggest that global warming, if any, is a natural process. For instance, Veizer, a Canadian geologist, who reconstructed the Earth's temperature record going back millions of years using isotopic techniques, found that "empirical observations on all time scales point to celestial phenomena as the principle driver of climate ... with greenhouse gases acting only as potential amplifiers ... The tiny carbon cycle is piggybacking on the huge water cycle (clouds included), not driving it. ... Models and empirical observations are both indispensable tools of science, yet when discrepancies arise, observations should carry greater weight than theory." (18)

Singer and Avery refer to considerable evidence of 1,500-year climate cycles in which the warming is of natural origin, and that this is responsible for most of the Earth's warming since 1850. Historic evidence shows similar recent warming periods from 200 BC to 600 AD (the Roman Warming) and from 950 to 1300 AD (the Medieval Warming) and respective cold periods from 600 AD to 900 AD (Dark Ages cold period) and from 1300 to 1850 AD (Little Ice Age). (19) The Maunder Sunspot Minimum occurred from 1640 to 1710, when there were virtually no sunspots at all. That marked the sun's weakest recent moment, and was the coldest point in the Little Ice Age. Solar variability is now the leading hypothesis to explain the roughly 1,500-year oscillation of the climate since the last Ice Age. (20)

(e) False Claims of Climate Change Effects

Below are refutations by climate scientists of various respective false claims shown in bold type.

Weather extremes such as droughts, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and heat waves have become more common.

Scientists have studied this issue and come to the opposite conclusion: extreme events are becoming LESS common. Atlantic hurricanes were much more numerous from 1950 to 1975 than from 1975 to present. Hailstorms in the US are 35% less common than they were fifty years ago. Extreme rainfall in the US at the end of the 20th century is comparable to what it was at the beginning of the 20th century. Roger Pielke, Jr, in the journal *Climatic Change* (1999) said "it is essentially impossible to attribute any particular weather event to global

warming." For flooding, Pielke did list a number of important non-climatic factors that have the potential to influence flooding in the future, including deteriorating dams and levees, changes in land use, building in flood-prone areas, governmental policies, as well as other societal influences. Pielke, R.A., JR. 1999. "Nine fallacies of floods", *Climatic Change* 42: 413-438. (21)

Kunkel et al. (1999) concluded, they saw "no apparent trend in climatic drought frequency" and "no evidence of changes in the frequency of intense heat or cold." Climate change is not a major factor because "trends in most related weather and climate extremes do not show comparable increases with time." (22)

Climate has been stable for a long time but now is getting increasingly extreme.

Climate swings are nothing new. Between 800 and 1300 AD, much of the world was several degrees warmer than today. People grew wine grapes in England, figs in Germany, assorted crops in Greenland. Then came the Little Ice Age, and temperatures considerably colder than today persisted until the climate warmed again around 1900. The likely cause? Changes in the sun's energy output, or perhaps the Earth's orbit, say Harvard-Smithsonian scientists, Sallie Baliunas and Willie Soon. (23)

CO2 is a pollutant.

CO2 is an essential nutrient for plants. Plants absorb CO2 and release oxygen, while animals inhale oxygen and exhale CO2. Researchers have proven that higher CO2 concentrations enable plants to grow faster and give them better drought tolerance. (24) See also source (1).

The sun is a constant source of energy.

The sun's radiation varies over many time scales, from short (11 year sunspot cycle, 20-27 year magnetic field) to medium (106- and 216 year cycles) to long (tens of thousands of years). Northern hemisphere temperature variations over the last 200 years closely match estimated solar intensity, as one would expect. (George Taylor, "Science Wake Up Call: There is More Hype Than Truth" National Association of Manufacturers, May 2004) (25)

Glaciers all over the world are shrinking because of global warming.

Dr Tim Patterson writes about Canadian glaciers, that researchers from the University of Calgary and the University of Western Ontario have shown that glaciers in the Lake Louise area and at the Athabaska Icefields have receded far above their present limits in the past. Before we get to this research, we should consider the conditions that cause glaciers to advance and retreat. Obviously, climate warming will cause melt-back of the toe of a glacier (retreat). The cause for advance is primarily increased snowfall at the top of a glacier (the accretion zone). The pressure of the new glacial ice at the top of the glacier will cause the glacier to start flowing downhill more rapidly than the toe is melting; hence, the advance. Cooler temperatures without the increase in snowfall will probably not halt the retreat. It is possible to have a retreat with cool temperatures and low precipitation, and it is possible to have an advance with warm temperatures and heavy snowfall. It has been recorded in the literature that waxing and waning of glaciers all over the world is a common occurrence and that any reference to this being an abnormal thing, due to Global Warming depends on selectively gathered "evidence". This has been remarkably

well illustrated in New Zealand in 2004 with the rapid advance of glaciers in the South Island with the only climatic change being very heavy precipitation. (26)

A huge rise in sea level is inevitable.

Singer and Avery (27) point out: sea level rise is a product of conflicting forces. Warmer temperatures cause the volume of water to expand. Warmer temperatures also melt glacier ice, creating more water. But warmer temperatures also evaporate more water from oceans and lakes. When clouds deposit the increased moisture from that rapid evaporation on polar ice caps and glaciers around the world, the ice caps and glaciers will grow, trapping more water, until or unless the local temperatures are warm enough to increase local melting.

Time is a critical factor. Ice melts slowly. Glaciers and ice caps can take thousands of years to melt completely because their surfaces reflect so much of the sun's heat. That is why the West Antarctic ice sheet, at least 10,000 years past its last Ice Age, still has another 7,000 years worth of ice to melt, according to John Stone of the University of Washington.

The world's longest set of sea-level observations at Stockholm, Sweden, tell us that "sea level changes due to northern hemisphere climate variations since 800 AD have probably always kept within -1.5 and +1.5 mm per year, with an average fairly close to zero. ... No studies have detected any significant acceleration during the 20th century.

Global temperatures will reach a tipping point, leading to dangerous runaway warming.

William Kinimonth, former head of Australia's National Climate Centre, concludes:

An increase to the concentration of CO₂ will enhance the greenhouse effect but only cause a modest increase in global surface temperatures. Water vapour is important in regulating the magnitude of the enhanced greenhouse effect in two ways: increased water vapour in the atmosphere has an amplifying effect on the CO₂ forcing; and, more importantly, increased evaporation constrains the surface temperature rise. It is the evaporation that is dominant because the Earth's surface is more than 70 percent ocean and much of the remainder is covered by transpiring vegetation. A doubling of CO₂ concentration by the end of the century from current levels will cause a modest global temperature rise not exceeding 1 degree C.

The computer models on which the IPCC based its fourth assessment projections have been shown to significantly underestimate the rate of increase of evaporation with temperature. As a consequence, surface temperature rise from CO₂ forcing is grossly exaggerated. Suggestions that global temperature might pass a 'tipping point' and even go into a phase of 'runaway global warming' are an outcome of the flawed computer models and are not a realistic future scenario. The extensive oceans and the hydrological cycle are a natural constraint on global temperature and dangerous anthropogenic global warming is not a feasible outcome. (28)

(f) Effect of Carbon Reduction Policy Implementation

The ultimate aim of the emission trading scheme (ETS) policy is to penalise heavily the use of coal-derived energy, so that it forces a changeover to high-cost inefficient 'clean' energy sources. This would raise energy prices substantially and impact on all areas of the economy. High energy prices would flow through to all Australian industries, and consequently cause substantial restructuring. Australia's comparative advantage in low-cost efficient energy for export-oriented industries would be destroyed. The Australian standard of living would be expected only to fall. Given that the Australian economy is presently in decline, this could hardly qualify as a suitable time for imminent ETS introduction.

Claims that substantial numbers of green jobs would be created, are in need of heavy qualification. Although it has been argued, e.g. by pro-green groups in the USA, that clean energy development and generation may employ many more jobs than in fossil-fuelled energy development (thanks to the former's low productivity), this appears to completely miss the vital point that it is the impact of the much higher costs of carbon policy on mining and manufacturing industries that has the potential for big job losses. (29)

As the overall aim of an alternative carbon tax system is the same as that of an emission trading scheme, its adoption would be expected to have a similar negative impact on the Australian economy.

The supposed impartiality of Commonwealth Treasury and the Garnaut study does not inspire confidence. It is surprising that Treasury modelling of CPRS adoption indicated little economic change. This suggests that Treasury is seriously underestimating the negative impact on the Australian economy of CPRS implementation. Garnaut supplemented his emissions reduction recommendations with alarmist claims about the loss of the Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu National Park should urgent action not be taken. In any case, their economic modelling details should be tabled for comment, and reviewed by independent consultants.

With the exception of nuclear power, the production technology of alternative energies is still very much in its infancy. Two main alternative so-called clean energies that an ETS or carbon tax system is intended to encourage, namely solar and wind energy, have yet to be developed to any satisfactory operating size and level of efficiency. Based on the history of major product research and development projects, they can be expected to take much longer to reach that capability, if at all, and require much larger investment than anticipated. Achieving a 20% low-carbon technology electricity generation target by 2020 appears highly unlikely according to the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering. Even if it were possible to achieve this, it appears unlikely that any reduction below year 2000 total CO₂ emissions would be achievable by 2020. (30)

In any case, solar and wind energy have serious inherent operating disadvantages. Solar energy is incapable of being produced outside daylight hours. Wind energy is incapable of being produced in the absence of wind, which is usually the case at night. Consequently, there could be a requirement to call on coal-derived energy to meet supply shortages, especially in evening peaks, whereas coal-fired power stations are not suitable for coping with sharp daily load variations.

Once an ETS or carbon tax system is implemented, there is always the risk that its taxing burden would be increased continually, particularly once it is realised that it is having no impact on lowering average temperature or CO₂ emission levels.

Because of the substantial impact that implementation of a CPRS would have on the Australian economy, it is considered imperative that proper cost-benefit analysis of alternative options is carried out and published for public scrutiny, before any Parliamentary CPRS decision is taken. Each of those cost-benefit analyses should spell out the post-implementation impacts on investment, prices, economic growth, trade and employment over at least the first 10 years.

However, as discussed in earlier parts of this submission, global warming, if any, is due to natural processes, and consequently there is no valid rationale for proceeding with the implementation of a CPRS. It follows that it is in the national interest to adopt a do-nothing policy and adapt to whatever global warming eventuates. To do otherwise would be an absolute waste of resources, and would cause irreparable economic damage in the process.

R V Barbero

3. Sources:

- (1) S.Fred Singer and Dennis T.Avery, "Unstoppable Global Warming – Every 1,500 Years", Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA, 2008, pp 173-175,192-193.
- (2) Bob Carter, "Due diligence required by the minister for misinformation", *The Age*, 30 July 2008.
- (3) Vincent Gray, "The IPCC: Spinning the Climate", 9 July 2008, <http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/spinningclimate0708.pdf>
- (4) Ibid
- (5) S.Fred Singer and Dennis T.Avery, "Unstoppable Global Warming – Every 1,500 Years", Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA, 2008, pp 118-135.
- (6) Vincent Gray, "The IPCC: Spinning the Climate", 9 July 2008,p15 <http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/spinningclimate0708.pdf>
- (7) Ibid p7. Gray defines 'validation' as a term used by computer engineers to describe the rigorous testing process that is necessary before a computer-based model can be put to use. It must include successful prediction over the entire range of circumstances for which it is required. Without this process it is impossible to find out whether the model is suitable for use or what levels of accuracy can be expected from it.
- (8) Ibid, pp 12,13
- (9) Ibid, p 16
- (10) David Bellamy, "The Price of Dissent on Global Warming", *The Australian*, 25 Nov 2008 <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,,24700827-17803,00.html>
- (11) Candace C.Crandall, "Bad Science, Bad Law: Poor Policies Cause a Flood of Damage", *San Diego Union-Tribune* 23 May1993 http://www.sepp.org/key%20issues/misuse/badsci_law.html
- (12) S.Fred Singer, <http://www.sepp.org/publications/books/gwunfbus.html>
- (13) S.Fred Singer and Dennis T.Avery, "Unstoppable Global Warming – Every 1,500 Years", Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA, 2008, p122
- (14) <http://www.petitionproject.org>
- (15) David Evans, "No Smoking Hot Spot", *The Australian*, 18 Jul 2008 <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,,24036736-17803,00.html>
- (16) Hans Schreuder, Piers Corbyn, Dr Don Parkes and Svend Hendriksen Letter of 14 Apr 2008 to IPCC http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/ipcc_letter_14april08.pdf
- (17) An Interview with Dr. Malcolm Ross, "...the Most Massive Abuse of Science I Have Seen", *Environment News*, June 1997. <http://www.sepp.org/key%20issues/misuse/macross.html>

- (18) S.Fred Singer and Dennis T.Avery, "Unstoppable Global Warming – Every 1,500 Years", Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA, 2008, p36.
- (19) Ibid pxi
- (20) Ibid pp 4,5,15-28
- (21) <http://icecap.us/index.php/go/faqs-and-myths#4>
- (22) Ibid
- (23) Ibid
- (24) Ibid
- (25) Ibid
- (26) Dr Tim Patterson
<http://www.friendsofscience.org/assets/files/documents/GLACIERS%20IN%20CANADA.pdf>
- (27) S.Fred Singer and Dennis T.Avery, "Unstoppable Global Warming – Every 1,500 Years", Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA, 2008, pp156,157
- (28) William Kinimonth, "A Natural Limit to Anthropogenic Global Warming", Heartland Institute, International Conference on Climate Change: 8-10 March 2009 <http://www.auscsc.org.au/images/PDF/naturallimittowarming.pdf>
- (29) Keith Orchison, "Few jobs replace carbon clouds", *The Australian*, 19 March 2009. <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,25207567-17803,00.html>
- (30) Martin Nicholson, "No way to reach Rudd's target", *The Australian*, 28 Jan. 2009. <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,,24972174-17803,00.html>
-