

There is no doubt the debate is complex, and one can understand politicians deferring to esteemed scientific bodies and the IPCC. However, the issues are too important to allow massive costs to be imposed on the Australian community without at least some questioning of the science – Is the Anthropogenic Global Warming hypothesis true, and (if it is happening – not demonstrated in recent years by the way) is CO2 a problem?

Referring to the latter issue, it is widely acknowledged that CO2 does have a warming effect, within limits. The physics demonstrate that if CO2 in atmosphere doubles from the current 380 ppm to 760 ppm, the Global Mean Temperature can be expected to increase by between 0.6 Deg C and 1.2 Deg C. However, James Hansen has received wide publicity for his claim that doubling CO2 will lead to a 3 deg C increase in Global Mean Temperature.

How does Dr Hansen prove his claim? There is no evidence for his claim, other than projections in climate models. The base assumptions that have to be incorporated into the models are very important. Perhaps the most important is the climate sensitivity issue. This is dominated by feedbacks. Hansen argues that the feedbacks to CO2 induced warming are positive, thus resulting in his 3 Deg C for doubled CO2 prognostication. However, other scientists, notably Dr Roy Spencer, but quite a few others, argue that the feedback loops are about neutral, or possibly even negative. If Spencer is correct, then a doubling of CO2 would lead to an overall increase in Global Mean Temperature of only 0.6 Deg C to 1.2 Deg C.

Who is right on this? Steve McIntyre of [www.climateaudit.org](http://www.climateaudit.org) has for quite some time been asking for a robust, engineering quality exposition and proof of the claim that a doubling in atmospheric CO2 levels will lead to a 3 Deg C increase in Global Mean Temperature. Despite his request receiving wide publicity, no one has stepped forward with the proof.

Surely, without such proof, how can the Australian Government commit the Australian people to the massive increased costs and disruption that the ETS entails.

A further factor is how confident are we that man's CO2 emissions will lead to a doubling of atmospheric CO2 levels? It seems that we really don't know that much about the CO2 cycle, and nature's ways of dealing with CO2 emissions. I venture to suggest too that the inadvertent CO2 emissions resulting from the Victorian bush fires will probably swamp anthropogenic emissions. How do we deal with CO2 from such events?

Also, Bob Carter is surely right in his request for analysis of the costs/benefits of the ETS scheme. That is the right question. Has it been asked?

Thank you for the opportunity to present a submission to the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy.

Ray Soper