

[Educating Senator Russell Trood](#)

A response to Russell Trood's newsletter in which he discusses the Coalition's environmental policy.

Dear Senator Trood,

Having perused your newsletter, I am appalled that you supported the massive government intervention in the marketplace by dictating Renewable Energy levels and timetables. That is the role of a marketplace operating in a fair playing field with no favours, with a wise government as the umpire. I am convinced our political leaders have lost all sense of reason and are betraying our country to blind mass hysteria whipped up by people like Al Gore and his cohorts.

1) Carbon Dioxide is NOT a pollutant, it is the 'oxygen' of plant life, and we need crops to sustain human life on earth.

2) Carbon Dioxide is a trace gas - less than 400 parts per million of all atmospheric gases. Nature is responsible for 97% of that gas. Humans contribute 3%. Australia contributes 1% of that 3% ie the proverbial three fifths of five eighths of Sweet Fanny Adams. By attempting to regulate (ergo TAX) that, our government has as much chance of influencing the climate as King Canute had in controlling the tides - Zip, Zilch, Zero.

3) By destroying our carbon-based economy with an endless barrage of propaganda lauding 'low carbon footprints', hysterical claims about sea rise, destruction of the Great Barrier Reef and other Australian Icons (the Sydney Opera House was stated to be at risk recently), the minds of the mindless are being programmed to accept the greatest scam ever perpetrated, Global Warming which morphed into Climate Change. These are half truths, both happen, but the inference that human activity is the cause is a blatant lie.

4) Emissions Trading will go down in history with the other litany of human mass stupidity, part of which was chronicled by Charles Adams in his book which has remained in print since first published in the 1840s, **Extraordinary popular delusions and the madness of crowds**.

Please read, please talk to some great Australians like Prof Ian Plimer, Prof Bob Carter, Prof Lance Endersbee, and a wise Australian geologist/farmer/philosopher called Viv Forbes.

Help get us off the yellow brick road which leads only to a smoke-and-mirrors fraud run by a dopey 'wizard'.

Regards

John McRobert BE (Civ)

Managing Director
CopyRight Publishing
Postal address: GPO Box 2927 Brisbane Q 4001
Phone 61 (0)7 3229 6366
Email: info@copyright.net.au
Web: www.copyright.net.au

Excerpt from Senator Trood's Newsletter - 03/09/2009

CPRS: the challenges ahead to Copenhagen

During the last session of parliament, the Rudd Government finally abandoned its counterproductive political game-playing with its Renewable Energy Bill and worked with the Opposition to secure its passage through the Senate. But the real challenge in the area of climate change lies ahead with the future of the Governments Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) still in doubt.

The Opposition joined with the minor parties in the Senate in voting down the current piece of legislation because it is completely unacceptable as it now stands. With only 1.5 percent of global emissions any action we might take towards abatement can only have a very limited impact on the overall problem of emissions. As I said in my [speech](#) to the Senate, the last thing we should be doing is putting in place a scheme that is not only unlikely to reduce emissions significantly, but will cost jobs, undermine Australias trade competitiveness, impose huge financial burdens on Australians and Australian businesses and, most particularly, burden rural and regional Australia, especially the agriculture sector, with additional costs that cannot be offset. Nor does the Opposition see any compelling need to have a scheme in place before the Copenhagen climate change meeting in December.

The likely cost burden of the Rudd Governments current scheme is significant compared to those in place or being considered by other countries. It is calculated that the proposed US scheme might impose a per capita cost of something in the vicinity of \$57. In Europe, it is only 80c, while in Australia the burden is likely to be in the vicinity of \$440 per person. That is a burden that no Australian should be forced to bear, particularly in the context of our low proportion of global emissions.

In response to the Governments flawed and ill considered scheme, the Coalition has set out [nine principal issues](#) it wishes to see addressed before being prepared to consider passage of the legislation. To date the Prime Minister continues to play politics with the issue and has refused to respond to the Oppositions position.

The Government's so far contemptuous take it or leave it approach raises serious doubts as to whether the Prime Minister is really committed to securing the passage of this legislation. None of the Government's arguments contending that the legislation is needed prior to Copenhagen deserve serious consideration. As the head of the United Nations climate change body, Yvo De Boer, has said what people care about in the international negotiations is the commitment that a government makes to take on a certain target. The Opposition has already assisted the Government with this by agreeing to a 5 percent reduction by 2020 based on 2000 emissions and an increased target if there is comprehensive international agreement.

The reality is that in Copenhagen in December it is highly unlikely there will be an agreement on a post-Kyoto climate change scheme and that negotiations will roll into the new year. Whether climate change is the biggest moral challenge of our time as Kevin Rudd contends, is open to considerable debate. What ought not to be in contest is that in crafting Australia's response to climate change, the Prime Minister should above all be taking account of Australia's national interests. To date, the Rudd Government has seemed more intent on being part of the global climate change glitterati, in pursuit of what it sees as a righteous environmental cause, than fulfilling its responsibility to the Australia electorate. Australia acting as the moral environmental conscience of the world may have its attractions, and few of us will disagree that we have a part to play, but surely it must be proportionate and not a gratuitous sell-out of our interests.