

Political Guts

Ray Jamieson
PO Box 200 Pacific Fair
Broadbeach Qld 4218
Phone 0411 113 110
www.politicalguts.com

Saturday, 1 November 2008

The Hon Peter Garret
The Hon Penny Wong
CC Prime Minister Kevin Rudd
PO Box 6022
House of Representatives
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Mr Garrett and Ms Wong

It is with much concern I acknowledge the momentum of the juggernaut which is the ETS, the Emissions Trading Scheme you have proposed to be in place by 2010. My concern is that with little real effort, I keep finding experts with very credible reasons to suggest that we stop, take a deep breath and closely examine the real issues of Global Warming and the influence of and importance of Carbon Dioxide in the climate change issue.

There is no denying that the climate is changing. In my own lifetime, from growing up on the land in Southern NSW, to now living in Queensland, I have seen and experienced the seasons change, as probably only someone such as a farmer who watches the weather for a living knows. There is less rainfall in South Eastern Australia now, but more in North West Australia. Our storms are different; our rainfall is different, not only in the amount, but the timing and the type of rainfall. Our frosts are different and our growing seasons are changing. Yes, climate change is occurring. However, as the enclosed articles suggest, the earlier information in my first letter to you on October 2nd 2008, on Energy and The Environment, and the further information on my website at <http://www.politicalguts.com/id6.html>, there is less solid evidence for this strategy than against it.

A prime concern for me is the core of the policy, based as it is on the Carbon Sequestration concept. Not a proven technology yet, but a concept, which even the most optimistic expectations have postulated that it may be proven feasible by 2020, but not a full scale working model until long after that, and only IF it works. There are even more experts who scoff at the idea as being practical, and even a layman could see why.

The suggestion is that we capture all the carbon gases emitted, bottle them and bury them underground, under the seabeds, or somewhere... The planet is not a goldfish bowl! Without a paradigm shift in both thinking and scientific advancement, there is no way that the physical logistics of capturing, handling, storing, then transporting and sequestering that volume, hundreds of millions of tonnes/cubic metres of a gas that can also seep out through the porous earth's crust materials to again be part of the atmosphere, can be physically managed. However, another issue is what to do with the CO₂ already in the atmosphere, if in fact CO₂ IS the problem! The evidence, as presented in the two enclosed documents suggests otherwise, and the further reading on my website would only serve to reinforce that claim.

Tim Flannery's recent quarterly essay "Now or Never" would be a more practical starting point IF CO₂ sequestering was proven to be necessary. Rather than costing us to try to capture and bury carbon dioxide, we could utilise CO₂ in the vigorous growth of sustainable forests, profiting our economy with the sale of mature timbers, complete with stored carbon, to go into housing ours or another population, and generally benefitting the global community and our GNP as well. Tim Flannery suggests that the forestry capacity for carbon sequestration far outweighs the potential capacity of any proposed carbon sequestration plant possibility, and we already have all the technology and infrastructure in place in 2008! Surely this strategy deserves much more consideration than an ETS which, by the time CO₂ is proven NOT to be the problem, will have destroyed our economy and bankrupted the nation.

In the current financial climate, investing billions of hard earned Australian Dollars into Carbon Sequestration, and banking on it to be our saviour from this supposed threat is very much akin to the Sub-Prime crisis in America. At least, the banks were left with some bricks and mortar there!

Carbon Dioxide is not the culprit, and neither is global warming. Our planet has been cooling since the turn of the century, as measured by every satellite based thermal measurement system. In my original letter to you on October 2nd 2008, I outlined where the real problems lie, and provided a range of solutions which we can begin to implement right now, in 2008. This may require some political pride swallowing, but please, let's get it over with early, rather than later, after the economy has been needlessly destroyed.

This is a little like blaming graffiti vandals for the crime problem, a highly visible distraction to the main game of organised crime, going on quietly elsewhere. The real problems are pollution in its many guises, climate change from mostly non anthropogenic reasons, social inequities requiring third world populations to destroy their local ecosystems for food and firewood in order to survive, and blinkered governments following agendas that can only be questioned by those with an objective view of the situation.

In this situation, governments globally need to be part of the solution, not the champions of the problem. Science will research global warming, while ever you fund it! However, that is different to solving the real problems of climate change. That requires a very different question. There is no global race to be the first to commit to an ETS, especially when so many of your own advisors suggest that it is the wrong policy. For Australia to be the only economy globally that chose this path, and to find that the experts we are now ignoring were correct, in a decade, who would pick up the pieces of our economy? We don't have to be first, we just have to get it right!

In my profession as a financial planner, were I to demonstrate such haste and apparent disregard for all of the facts and contrary evidence when preparing this financial plan for a client, I am certain I would lose my Authority to operate. Whilst the Australian population has the right to take away your mandate at the next election, the damage will have been done by then, and this is a one way road to national financial ruin. Some changes, no matter how disastrous, cannot easily be reversed! As David Evans, author of one of the enclosed documents says, it would also be the political end for the party or philosophy that proposed and delivered the flawed policy.

What else must I do to prevent this rapidly accelerating and impending disaster of the ETS hysteria, from bankrupting our great nation?

Please, study the two enclosed documents. They are by David Evans, a consultant to the Australian Greenhouse Office from 1999 to 2005, and Don Aitken, who has been Chairman of the Australian Research Grants Committee, the National Research Fellowships Committee and the Australian Research Council, a member of the Australian Science and Technology Council, the Primary Industry and Energy Research Council, and of a number of other research and science bodies. Then go to my website at www.politicalguts.com/id6 and read other expert testimonies there. I have no doubt that the most ardent supporter of the ETS, if they read and fully understood the articles presented by experts there, some of whom have been consultants to yours and previous government, scientists whose work framed current climate change policies, they would concede that rushing into the ETS by 2010 is not a sound investment for the national economy.

After studying and consulting further, please reconsider this urgent rush to "keep a political promise", and consult much more widely, across the scientific and business communities. There are valid reasons why other nations are not rushing into the ETS concept. Your wider consulting will tell you why that is. I hope, for our nation's sake, that you learn those reasons in time.

Sincerely

Ray Jamieson
Author
www.politicalguts.com

www.politicalguts.com