

## CARBON POLLUTION REDUCTION SCHEME

May2009

The purpose and intent of the proposed scheme is based only on political action (a show of support and preliminary agenda to target CO2 emissions). Yes the **Government** has no leadership ability to admit that the direct warming effect from extra CO2 is relatively small – too small to be of practical concern (a fact that virtually everyone now agrees with). Most likely the **Government** may not care for climate truth.

This Government playing **Al Gore's** game is calling CO2 a pollutant, a dirty, foul, impure gas. Yet CO2 is not that, it is a crucial component of plant, plankton, and animal life. What a bizarre call by the Government! So clearly this **Government** is on a political agenda.

As for the independent thinkers in a **Parliament** consisting of laypersons how is it possible to take a position on anthropogenic global warming without having the ability to understand the science? A grounding in physics, mathematics, and statistical method is essential to comprehend the specialties that comprise the weather system, solar physics, meteorology, hydrology, oceanography, glaciology, geology, geomorphology, and for historical data paleontology. That's within the grasp of only a few dozen people.

How many parliamentarians know there are no currently known technologies to replace fossil fuels on the massive scale necessary for world energy needs on a daily basis (notwithstanding nuclear electrical energy)? How many know that renewable energy methods only nibble at the edges and cannot power our current lifestyles and future populations until an advanced technology is discovered?

**IPCC** and **Gore** junk-science has been discredited in all their key areas. The famous hockey stick, the CO2 duration life in the atmosphere, the sea levels, surface temperatures, and of course the all important "consensus scientific view", have all fallen apart. None can be substantiated so fraud and lies are part of the propaganda.

**Gore** and Church of Earth, extreme Greens, believers, and vested interests including the controlled media have resorted to alarmist outcome stories. Demonizing of dissent is the order, with threats of unemployment, refusals to publish contrary science, banning technical presentations, personal smears of scientists with a contrary view. What have the AGW lobby got to fear if they are convinced they are right?

Of course the Carbon Reduction Scheme by Australia will not control climate. The **Government (Rudd, Wong, Combet** all laypersons) is willfully marching to the beat of the Greens salivating at the ideal opportunity for political change. Notwithstanding that in decades time with depletion of gas and oil reserves new energy methods must be found hence research and development is essential. For that CO2 has no relevance.

What is the Opposition (**Turnbull**) doing? Probably hamstrung unable to show common sense and responsible leadership! Without personal competence in climate science mechanics, **Turnbull** would be mauled by smear and abuse, that method although wilting in credibility in the US still works in a media censored Australia.

The following is relevant: **The costs to reduce CO2 emissions by 1 tonne:**

Building Renovations (90% of cases)	<0
Modernizing an old black-coal power station	\$35
Replacing black-coal with natural gas	\$65
Brown-coal plant with carbon capture technology	\$55
Replacing brown-coal with natural gas	\$90
Black-coal plant with carbon capture technology	>\$90
Wind energy	\$90-\$140
Solar energy	\$540-\$900

Clearly wind and solar are not efficient! And **Germany, Denmark, England** can show that wind means about 25% power efficiency and that at times there is zero power. There is no technology for “super-batteries”.

The **IPCC-Gore** spin on CO2 AGW is disassembling as natural climate variability dictates. Current surface temperatures, polar ice levels, sea levels, ocean acidification, and ocean temperatures, are all contrary to **IPCC** scenario climate modeling predictions; sea surface temperatures (SST) indicate source/sink behavior of the ocean during El Nino and La Nino years and there’s no correlation between CO2 emissions and temperatures.

**Flannery** (kangaroo expert), **Hoegh-Gulberg** (marine life expert), **Garnaut** (economist political pretend climatologist), front row CO2 crusaders in Australia may now be looking for a rock to hide.

Unfortunately the most fanatical have high-jacked such a crucial issue to run a political war on the world economy and free-living. Easy to do, it is beyond most politicians to recognize unsubstantiated scientific argument.

AGW alarmists claim almost daily that everything, just everything, is the result or proof of CO2 emissions, why does this still not alert politicians this is a con? Politicians should not be more gullible than the population!

Then there are the propagandists Church of Earth bodies **WWF, ACF, ACI, Green Peace;** of course **CSIRO** with self survival vested interest, the **ABC** with political correctness, the **AGE** for political identity, and individuals **Dee** (Fox weatherman), **Gell** (TV weatherman) journos from Melbourne papers, **Toohy** (AFR), **Karoly** (Australian), **Manne** (Australian), **Galacho** (Herald-Sun), **Breusch** (AFR). Not much interest in the truth there; all typical of **ABC’s Late-Line Tony Jones** (expert TV presenter) interviewing **Combet**, was annoyed and alarmed that **Senator Fielding** has gone to USA to a conference headed by a Non-Governmental Panel of climate scientists and environmental and resource economists. **Jones** prefers to “keep his head in the sand” (his words).

Layperson facts;

~Of the total GHG in the atmosphere, water vapor is dominant at between 85-90%, clouds at 5% or 10%, CO2 is at only 3%; all up the total GHG provides a basic 33C surface warming to the planet.

~The man made CO2 annual flux is 7-10bill tones, less than 5% of the CO2 emitted by plants, land and ocean at 210bill tones.

~For every 100,000 atmosphere molecules there are currently 39 CO2 molecules. There will be 40 CO2 molecules in 5 years, and that may double to 80 molecules by end of century providing we don't run out of oil and gas!

~A doubling of a very small man-made CO2 quantity (0.04% to 0.08%) is still a very small proportion of the total GHG. The effect on temperature would be very small.

*From the time **IPCC** was set up 20 years ago to specifically propose a scientific based argument that man made CO2 emissions would cause catastrophic climates, you know we will frazzle, dry up, then drown, their mission has been relentless.*

**IPCC FAR** (2007) targeted politicians with a fraudulent but now discredited report. It was easy. The science is complex, there are so many interdependencies, so the **IPCC** modelers mimicked the recent past "weather" whilst manipulating input forcings and climate sensitivities to link CO2 to a catastrophic future. They still continue their "astrology like" behavior.

**Obama** (the hope of Greens) and **Rudd** have said "the science is settled". Stupid comments! The science of climate is far from settled. Theirs is not a statement of leadership or integrity. In most jobs that would be negligent. Intelligent leadership and integrity would insist science uncertainty and disagreement to independent peer reviews and engage continuing diverse research. How many in the CSIRO are doing that?

Emil Zyhajlo BE, BCom, FIEAust, CPEng