

Submission to the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy:

I refer the Committee to the following Newspaper article:

http://blogs.news.com.au/dailytelegraph/piersakerman/index.php/dailytelegraph/comments/rudd_tangled_up_in_inconvenient_truths/

I quote: "Speaking of which, with no fewer than nine taxpayer-funded inquiries either just ended or in their final throes, it's clear the Rudd government's obsession with the discredited anthropogenic global warming theory has left it increasingly isolated, as it pushes for a job-destroying emissions-trading system.

Environment Minister Peter Garrett strayed into loopy Dark Green territory when he endorsed the view that melting ice could raise sea levels by as much as 6m, even as scientific reports were showing that the area of Antarctic sea ice has been increasing annually for decades. That's the problem with the theories that Garrett and Climate Change Minister Penny Wong have been pushing: they're only theories, based on extremely dodgy modelling, and they lack sound scientific backing. Professor Ian Plimer, whose 503-page book *Heaven + Earth - Global Warming: The Missing Science* (Connor Court publishing) was launched on Wednesday, makes up for the government's failure. Whereas the government relies on flawed modelling and populists such as Al Gore, whose film must now carry a warning about its untruthful elements, Plimer's book is larded with footnotes and furnished with a nine-page index, underscoring the thorough research behind it. Little wonder that no one from Rudd's team of tame experts will debate Plimer on this subject: even garrulous Ross Garnaut has apparently been struck dumb in the face of a purely scientific argument."

I submit that some or all of the committee should read Professor Plimer's book, rather than relying on the output from the IPCC which is a political rather than a scientific body.

I do not believe that Climate Change is the main problem facing Australia today. I believe Australia has two far more urgent problems, both of which arise from population growth, rather than from climate change:

1) Increasing demand for **water** for agriculture, industry and City water supplies. Australia has a predominantly dry climate in the populated areas, and no significant dams have been constructed for several decades to capture our infrequent flooding rains. We should as a National priority build infrastructure to harvest, retain and recycle water – this shortage is a clear and present danger to the population of large parts of Australia. Dams built to store flood water could in some places also be used to produce clean green hydro-electric power (see point 2).

2) Increasing demand for base load **power** cannot be met by wind or solar power generation when the wind is not blowing during the night, so a reliable on-call power generation capacity is what is needed. If the ETS is enacted, the simplest way to reduce our carbon emissions is to shut down all the coal fired power stations in Australia after replacing them with nuclear plants, and then build more nuclear stations as required. Wind or solar power generation can be useful for running desalination plants and pumping stations during daylight hours and when the wind is blowing, so that the output is saved as fresh water in our reservoirs, but neither are reliable sources of base load power.

I submit that solving these two problems will benefit all Australians regardless of whether Climate Change exists or not. I could add public transport infrastructure as a third goal for policy makers, as this would also have long term benefits for the population, but if we don't secure supplies of water and energy, transport will be the least of our problems. If you don't solve these two problems, an emissions trading scheme will do nothing except increase costs to consumers and export Australian jobs overseas.

I personally believe Carbon Dioxide to be a harmless by-product of combustion which is actually beneficial to plants, and that we should concentrate on eliminating known harmful combustion by-products such as Sulphur Dioxide from our smokestacks, but if we are stupid enough to create an artificial market for Carbon credits which creates a financial benefit for reduced carbon output, then Nuclear Power stations are the only currently economic solution, if Federal and State planners reject new hydro dams as being politically too unpopular.

Regards,

Allen Horrell