

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 28 September 2011, Page 3981

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON (21:14):

I rise to speak to this motion of the Hon. Mark Parnell, and I thank him for putting climate change on the agenda again. But it will be of no surprise to members in here that I do not subscribe to the hysteria of man-made climate change that has been portrayed by lobby groups who are connected with some pretty shady people; and, of course, the Club of Rome is one of the big players and instigators of the climate change issue and almost solely responsible for the propaganda and strategies used to raise climate change hysteria.

I will probably be taken outside and stoned after I finish this speech, but that is okay. I would just like to put on the record a few of the emails or parts of the emails that came out as a result of the 'climategate' affair. Professor Chris Folland, Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research, states:

The data doesn't matter. We're not basing our recommendations on data. We're basing them on the climate models.

Dr David Frame, climate modeller of Oxford University, states:

The models are convenient fictions that provide something very useful.

Paul Watson, co-founder of Greenpeace, states:

It doesn't matter what is true, it only matters what people believe is true.

Sir John Houghton, first chairman of the IPCC, says:

Unless we announce disasters, no-one is going to listen.

Christine Stewart, a former Canadian minister of the environment, states:

No matter if the science of global warming is all phoney, climate change provides the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world.

Other members of the Club of Rome—and it is all on public record—include Alexander King, co-founder of the Club of Rome, premier environmental think tank and consultant to the United Nations. His 1991 book, *The First Global Revolution*, states:

The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.

Professor Stephen Schneider (Stanford professor of biology and global change) was among the earliest and most vocal proponents of man-made global warming, and a lead author of many of the IPCC reports. He is a member of the Club of Rome, and he says.

We need to get some broad-based support to capture the public's imagination, so we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and make little mention of any doubts. .. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest.

Timothy Wirth, President of the United Nations Foundation and another member of the Club of Rome, says:

We've got to ride this global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy.

Al Gore, is a member of the Club of Rome and set to become the world's first carbon billionaire. He also is the largest shareholder of the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) which looks set to become the world's central carbon trading body. He says:

I believe it is appropriate to have an over-representation of the facts on how dangerous it is [climate change] as a predicate for opening up the audience.

Maurice Strong sits on the board of directors for CCX. He was the executive director of the United Nations' environment program, he was Al Gore's mentor and he is also a member of the Club of Rome. Back before he became the US President, President Obama served on the board of directors for the Joyce Foundation when it gave CCX nearly \$1.1 million in two separate grants that were instrumental in developing and launching the privately owned Chicago Climate Exchange, which now calls itself North America's only cap and trade system for all six greenhouse gases with global affiliates and projects worldwide.

Essentially, Obama helped fund the profiteers of the carbon taxation program that he then steered through Congress. Mikhail Gorbachev, a former president of the Soviet Union, also a member of the Club of Rome, stated:

The threat of environmental crisis will be the international disaster key that will unlock the new world order.

It goes on and on. We have many, many influential people. We have Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, member of the Club of Rome, who stated:

If I were reincarnated, I would wish to be returned to earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels.

In these times of access to information, there is no way for a government to contain the information floating around in cyberspace. More and more people are turning to their own sources to become informed on issues that will affect them and their children.

The usual sarcastic response will be, 'The internet is full of nutters and the information is not accurate.' Well, that all depends on the information sources you access. It also assists that many politicians and scientists around the world are placing their findings on the web because of the information blanket that has been placed over any and all science that does not support the government line of gloom and doom.

I attended the event Feast and Famine with Bob Katter—'Mad Katter', as he is called—as a guest speaker and let me just say that it was refreshing to hear a man of many years' experience in politics review better times in this country and recall politicians who had the courage to stand up for this country and make it a great nation. I remember better times myself—and have said it often in this place—a time when politicians still played their games, but, at the end of the day, their decisions were always made in the best interests of this country and its citizens and great things were achieved.

Those days are gone and we now bow and scrape before the UN to implement whatever laws and policies it desires. This is part of the globalisation of the world and we now know that the Greens are supportive of a one-world government and all that comes with that, after Mr Brown made that declaration himself in parliament.

There is nothing like swapping and changing in order to push forward with an ideology. The scientific arguments could not be won on fact, so we were bombarded with emotionally-charged arguments and motherhood statements about scientific consensus and also to convince us that we are all running out of time.

The people know that we are being conned and they are angry that they are treated like idiots. For me, the straw that broke the camel's back was when CO₂ was declared a pollutant. Biology 101 says that CO₂ is a natural and essential element in our atmosphere. It is essential for plants, for the natural process of photosynthesis which, simply put, feeds our plant life and also produces oxygen. I am sure most members understand that plants feed on CO₂ and convert CO₂ to oxygen during the day and then convert oxygen to CO₂ of a night; that is what photosynthesis is. So, in fact, if CO₂ is an issue, it could equally translate that the only way to prevent carbon emissions is to eliminate plant life altogether, but we know this would be counterproductive for the environment and the planet.

The Green movement cannot have it both ways—calling for reforestation and then claiming that the food of those forests is, indeed, a pollutant. I am no scientist and nor is anyone else in this place, so we all rely on information from those who are qualified to make determinations on scientific and evidence-based public policy.

The risk is always though, who do we believe? When government has an agenda, it also needs the science to back it up. When having to justify one or more big taxes, of course it must convince the people that their hard-earned money must be taken from them in order to fix that big problem.

Most of us do know that there are numerous stakeholders who have a lot to gain from the hoax of climate change and that the biggest loser will be average Joe, who works more and more for less and less. It seems the government is least of all concerned with the family who cannot afford to feed, clothe and provide shelter and education for their children. God knows, we see ample examples of that in this place.

The Hon. Mark Parnell wants us to acknowledge The Critical Decade report of the Climate Commission, so I will and I will make it clear that I am always suspicious of any report or any commission that is preparing anything for government at a time when the public are screaming out that enough is enough. Part 1 of a scientific audit of the Climate Commission report by Bob Carter, David Evans, Stewart Franks and William Kininmonth stated:

Over many decades thousands of scientists have painted an unambiguous picture: the global climate is changing and humanity is almost surely the primary cause. The risks have never been clearer and the case for action has never been more urgent.

This declaration establishes two things. The first sentence signals that the report is committed to repeating the conclusions of the 4th Assessment Report of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC), conclusions that are essentially reliant on computer modelling and lack empirical support. And the second signals that the report is long on opinionated analysis and political advocacy but devoid of objective risk analysis.

These same characteristics apply to the scientific basis of four earlier Australian global warming documents , in order the Garnaut review, two reports [of] the Department of Climate Change, a report by the Academy of Science, and finally a science briefing that Professor Steffen provided to the Multi-party Committee on Climate Change in November , 2010, prior to that committee entering policy-setting mode.

The conclusion of this audit is:

The scientific advice contained within The Critical Decades is an inadequate, flawed and misleading basis on which to set national policy. The report is emotive and...throughout, ignores sound scientific criticism of IPCC shibboleths that has been made previously, and is shotgun in its approach and at the same time selective in its use of evidence. The arguments presented depend heavily upon unvalidated computer models the predictions of which have been wrong for the last 23 years, and which are unremittingly and unjustifiably alarmist in nature. Further, in concentrating upon the hypothetical risk of human-caused warming, the Climate Commission has all but ignored the very real and omnipresent risks of dangerous natural climate-related events and change, which are certain to continue to occur in the future.

Notwithstanding the misassertions of the Climate Commissioners, independent scientists are confident overall that there is no evidence of global warming at a rate faster than for the two major 20th century phases of natural warming; no evidence of sea level rise at a rate greater than the 20th century natural rise of 1.7 millimetres per year; no evidence of acceleration in sea-level change in either the tide gauge or satellite records; and nothing unusual about the behaviour of mountain glaciers, Arctic sea ice or the Greenland or West Antarctic ice sheets.

Regarding the often remarked need to cut carbon dioxide emissions nonetheless—as a 'precautionary principle' approach to perceived dangerous warming—it must be noted that you can't take specific precautions against an unknown future temperature path. The currently quiet sun, and the established lack of warming over the last ten years, may presage enhanced cooling over the next two decades, as indeed is predicted by some solar physicists. In such circumstances, it can be argued that precautions currently need to be taken against cooling rather than warming. But in reality, and given our inability to predict even the near-term climate future, the only sensible course of action is to strengthen society's resilience against all climate hazards, and to prepare to cope with warmings, coolings and climatic instantaneous or step events—one and all, and as they come.

In other words, the prudent and most cost-effective national policy is to prepare for all climate events and change, whether they are of certain natural or hypothetical human causation, and to adapt to such events as they occur. Prudence and careful contingency preparation are required in anticipation of both warming and cooling events, for both are certain to occur again in future.

As they have in the past. Dr David Evans consulted full-time for the Australian Greenhouse Office, now the Department of Climate Change, from 1991 to 2005, and part-time from 2008 to 2010, modelling Australia's carbon in plants, debris, mulch, soils and forestry and agricultural products. Evans is a mathematician and engineer with six university degrees, including a PhD from Stanford University in electrical engineering.

The area of human endeavour with the most experience and sophistication in dealing with feedbacks and analysing complex systems is electrical engineering, and the most crucial and disputed aspects of understanding the climate system are the feedbacks. The evidence supporting the idea that CO₂ emissions were the main cause of global warming reversed itself from 1998 to 2006, causing Evans to move from being a warmist to a sceptic.

I have here the speech that Dr Evans made in Perth on 23 March 2011, and I am going to read it in full:

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

The debate about global warming has reached ridiculous proportions and is full of micro thin half-truths and misunderstandings. I am a scientist who was on the carbon gravy train, understands the evidence, was once an alarmist, but am now a skeptic. Watching this issue

unfold has been amusing but, lately, worrying. This issue is tearing society apart, making fools and liars out of our politicians.

... The whole idea that carbon dioxide is the main cause of the recent global warming is based on a guess that was proved false by empirical evidence during the 1990s. But the gravy train was too big, with too many jobs, industries, trading profits, political careers, and the possibility of world government and total control riding on the outcome. So rather than admit they were wrong, the governments, and their tame climate scientists, now cheat and lie outrageously to maintain the fiction that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant.

Let's be perfectly clear. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, and other things being equal, the more carbon dioxide in the air, the warmer the planet. Every bit of carbon dioxide that we emit warms the planet. But the issue is not whether carbon dioxide warms the planet, but how much.

Most scientists, on both sides, also agree on how much a given increase in the level of carbon dioxide raises the planet's temperature, if just the extra carbon dioxide is considered. These calculations come from laboratory experiments; the basic physics have been well known for a century.

...The planet reacts to that extra carbon dioxide, which changes everything. Most critically, the extra warmth causes more water to evaporate from the oceans. But does the water hang around and increase the height of moist air in the atmosphere, or does it simply create more clouds and rain? Back in 1980, when the carbon dioxide theory started, no one knew. The alarmists guessed that it would increase the height of moist air around the planet, which would warm the planet even further, because the moist air is also a greenhouse gas.

This is the core idea of every official climate model: for each bit of warming due to carbon dioxide, they claim it ends up causing three bits of warming due to extra moist air. The climate models amplify the carbon dioxide warming by a factor of three—so two thirds of their projected warming is due to extra moist air (and other factors), only one third is due to extra carbon dioxide.

I'll bet you didn't know that. Hardly anyone in the public does, but it's the core of the issue. All the disagreements, lies, and misunderstanding spring from this. The alarmist case is based on this guess about moisture in the atmosphere, and there is simply no evidence for the amplification that is at the core of their alarmism. Which is why the alarmists keep so quiet about it and you've never heard of it before. And it tells you what a poor job the media have done in covering this issue.

Weather balloons have been measuring the atmosphere since the 1960s, many thousands of them every year. The climate models all predict that as the planet warms, a hot-spot of moist air will develop over the tropics about 10km up, as the layer of moist air expands upwards into the cool dry air above. During the warming of the late 1970s, 80s and 90s, the weather balloons found no hot-spot. None at all. Not even a small one. This evidence proves that the climate models are fundamentally flawed, that they have greatly overestimate the temperature increases due to carbon dioxide.

...At this point, official 'climate science' stopped being a science. You see, in science empirical evidence always trumps theory, no matter how much you are in love with the theory. If theory and evidence disagree, real scientists scrap the theory. But official climate science ignored the crucial weather balloon evidence, and other subsequent evidence that backs it up, and instead clung to their carbon dioxide theory—that just happens to keep them in well-paying jobs with lavish research grants, and gives great political power to their government masters.

There are now several independent pieces of evidence showing that the Earth responds to the warming due to extra carbon dioxide by dampening the warming. Every long-lived natural system behaves this way, counteracting any disturbance, otherwise the system would be unstable. The climate system is no exception, and now we can prove it.

But the alarmists say the exact opposite, that the climate system amplifies any warming due to extra carbon dioxide, and is potentially unstable. Surprise surprise, their predictions of planetary temperature made in 1988 to the US Congress, and again in 1990, 1995, and 2001, have all proved much higher than reality.

They keep lowering the temperature increases they expect, from 0.30C per decade in 1990, to 0.2 0C per decade in 2001, and now 0.15C per decade—yet they have the gall to tell us 'it's worse than expected'. These people are not scientists. They over-estimate the temperature increases due to carbon dioxide, selectively deny evidence, and now they cheat and lie to conceal the truth.

...The official thermometers are often located in the warm exhaust of air conditioning outlets, over hot tarmac at airports where they get blasts of hot air from jet engines, at wastewater plants where they get warmth from decomposing sewage, or in hot cities choked with cars and buildings. Global warming is measured in tenths of a degree, so any [extra] heating nudge is important. In the US, nearly 90% of official thermometers surveyed by volunteers violate official siting requirements that they not be too close to an artificial heating source. Nearly 90%! The photos of these thermometers are on the Internet; you can get them via the corruption paper at my site, sciencespeak.com. Look at the photos, and you will never trust a government climate scientist again.

They place their thermometers in warm localities, and call the results 'global' warming. Anyone can understand that this is cheating. They say that 2010 is the warmest recent year, but that was almost the warmest at various airports, selected air conditioners and certain car parks.

Global temperature is also measured by satellites, which measure nearly the whole planet 24/7 without bias. The satellites say the hottest recent year was in 1998, and that since 2001 the global temperature has levelled off .

...If reality is warming up, as the government climate scientists say, why do they present only the surface thermometer results and not mention the satellite results? And why do they put their thermometers near artificial heating sources? This is so obviously a scam now .

.. .The earth has been in a warming trend since the depth of the Little Ice Age around 1680. Human emissions of carbon dioxide were negligible before 1850 and have nearly all come after WWII, so human carbon dioxide cannot possibly have caused the trend. Within the trend the Pacific Decadal Oscillation causes alternating global warming and cooling for 25 - 30 years at a go in each direction. We have just finished a warming phase, so expect mild global cooling for the next two decades .

... Official climate science, which is funded and directed entirely by government, promotes a theory that is based on a guess about moist air that is now a known falsehood. Governments gleefully accept their advice, because the only way to curb emissions are to impose taxes and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government—how exciting for political class!

...Even if Australia stopped emitting all carbon dioxide tomorrow, completely shut up shop and we went back to the stone age, according to the official government climate models it

would be cooler in 2050 by about 0.015 degrees. But their models exaggerate tenfold—in fact, our sacrifices would make the planet in 2050 a mere 0.0015 degrees cooler!

.. . Finally, to those of you who still believe the planet is in danger from our carbon dioxide emissions: sorry, but you've been had. Yes carbon dioxide is a cause of global warming, but it's so minor it's not worth doing much about.

Lord Christopher Monckton is one of the world's most outspoken critics of the climate change debate and one can go to the now world-famous interview he did with a member of Greenpeace about the facts of climate change based on research from the University of Illinois and, of course, from the data collected from those satellites up there and beyond responsible for collecting and feeding information to our scientists on the ground about the state of our planet.

This member of Greenpeace was protesting about a gathering of climate change scientist sceptics who were presenting their research papers at a conference. Lord Monckton asked this member where she got her information and she cited the Greenpeace movement's magazines, newspapers and news reports as her main sources. When he offered her websites to go to access the scientific information, her response was, 'Well, I'm very busy. I have a life and I simply do not have time to spend searching for information.' That is what these climate change alarmists have relied upon. It is just all too hard for most—at least that used to be the case.

I know of thousands of people now who have abandoned mainstream media for their information because they are seeing so much conflicting information elsewhere and they are hearing the same information from many sources. This is not being disrespectful to science. This is actually acknowledging true science from corporate science. They are sceptical—and rightly so. The days of 'trust me I am the government' are well and truly over.

That particular video clip sent shock waves among average citizens who identified with that member of Greenpeace as being nothing more than sponges soaking up a propaganda campaign that would inevitably drain our money and destroy our lifestyle in this country as we know it. The usual tactics were deployed: criticise and destroy credibility, humiliate and denigrate. But it did not work, and Lord Monckton was received in this country by people who were seeking the truth about what was being flung upon us via a carbon tax in the name of saving the planet when, in fact, this is about the rich getting richer and the poor getting very, very much poorer.

This is demonstrated in an article in the *Telegraph* on Monday 12 September 2011 which states, 'Al Gore could become world's first carbon billionaire.' This is the same man who refuses to debate Lord Monckton publicly and whose book, *An Inconvenient Truth*, was ruled by the High Court of the UK as being unsuitable for inclusion in the school curriculum because of the inaccuracy of information.

Lord Christopher Monckton has been one of those most outspoken scientists, as I said, and we are all very familiar with how some in the media tried to debunk him and his qualifications while in Australia. No-one, as far as I am aware, promoted the fact that just prior to coming here this year he won a debate in the prestigious Oxford Union Society on climate change. I quote from an article on this momentous occasion:

For what is believed to be the first time ever in England, an audience of university undergraduates has decisively rejected the notion that 'global warming' is or could become a global crisis. The only previous defeat for climate extremism among an undergraduate audience was at St Andrew's University, Scotland, in the spring of 2009, when the climate extremists were defeated by just three votes.

Last week, members of the historic Oxford Union Society, the world's premier debating society, carried the motion 'That this House would put economic growth before combating climate change' by 135 votes to 110. The debate was sponsored by the Science and Public Policy Institute, Washington DC.

Serious observers are interpreting the shock result as a sign that students are now impatiently rejecting the relentless extremist propaganda taught under the guise of compulsory environmental-studies classes in British schools, confirming opinion-poll findings that the voters are no longer frightened by 'global warming' scare stories, if they ever were.

This debate on climate change is tearing our society apart, and it is not doing our Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, any favours either. She has been criticised in the *New York Times* for her decision to introduce a carbon tax when the rest of the world is rejecting this notion, and she is also accused of putting Australia at financial risk if she persists with her intention.

I also note a report written by glaciologist, Jørgen Peder Steffensen, that core samples from the Greenland glaciers reveal that we are living in the coolest period of the last 10,000 years. It is my information that the two scientific professions we should be listening to in this debate for scientific truth are the geologists and the glaciologists; but no-one from these sciences is on the Climate Commission. We have meteorologists who are flat out predicting the weather a week in advance and others who, for the purpose of proving the fact of man-made climate change, are out of their depth and area of expertise.

We hear that a consensus has been reached when, in fact, this is not the case. We also see and hear the hypocrisy of many involved in the climate change swindle—those who have found a way to further capitalise from the hard-earned money of everyday citizens. If we are concerned about climate change in reality, then why are we not hearing any more of the disruption of the Mexican Gulf, which is the heart and lungs of the oceanic systems and which contributes to regulating our weather? That disaster was not caused by an average Joe, and the devastation caused will never truly be rectified.

I notice there are no motions, or no concerns are being expressed in this place, to hold BHP and the Obama administration accountable for this man-made disaster of epic proportions. No, we are much busier in this place wasting our time on a debate that the majority of people believe is a load of hogwash. Those people include leading scientists in their field who we would demonise and whose character we attempt to assassinate rather than listen to common sense because it does not serve the global political agenda that is being served.

We have seen some catastrophic things happen to our environment, but it is not the citizens: it is the corporations that are responsible. And what is our government doing about that? Rewarding the real polluters via the carbon tax. This, of course, was affirmed by Melbourne's Grattan Institute, which stated, 'Study finds compensation proposed in carbon draft bill is unnecessary or justified.' This particular article outlined that the Grattan study shows that these polluters are going to be rewarded for polluting this planet. Meanwhile, we will all be paying far more for our power, and our cost of living is going to increase simply because we have to proceed with this climate change agenda.

One of Australia's foremost experts on the relationship between climate change and sea levels has written a peer-reviewed paper concluding that rises in sea levels are decelerating. The analysis by New South Wales principal coastal specialist Phil Watson calls into question one of the key criteria for large-scale inundation around the Australia coast by 2100—the assumption of an accelerating rise in sea levels because of climate change.

Based on century-long tide gauge records at Fremantle, Western Australia (from 1897 to the present), Auckland Harbour in New Zealand (from 1903 to present), Port Denison in Sydney

in Sydney Harbour (1914 to present) and Pilot Station at Newcastle (1925 to present), the analysis finds that there was a 'consistent trend of weak deceleration' from 1940 to 2000. Mr Watson's findings, published in the *Journal of Coastal Research* this year and now attracting broader attention, supports a similar analysis of long-term tide gauges in the United States earlier this year. Both raise questions about the CSIRO's sea level predictions.

Climate change researcher Howard Brady at Macquarie University said yesterday that the recent research meant that sea levels accepted by the CEO were 'already dead in the water as having no sound basis in probability'. He went on to say:

In all cases it is clear that sea level rise, although occurring, has been decelerating for at least the last half of the 20th century, and so the present trend would only produce sea levels of around 15cm for the 21st century.

The weather cycle for Australia has always been a severe one. We are either in boom or bust in this country—severe drought followed by floods—and that has been the way ever since I can remember, and that is far longer than a decade or so. In fact, the Australian Bureau of Statistics states:

Australia's most severe drought periods since the beginning of European settlement appear to have been those of 1895-1903 and 1958-68. The 1982-83 drought was possibly the most intense with respect to the area affected by severe rainfall deficiencies. These periods were comparable in their overall impact, but differed appreciably in character.

The 1958-68 drought period is described in the article contained in the 1968 Year Book No. 54. That drought period was widespread and probably second only to the 1895-1903 drought period in severity. The areas affected and the durations of drought were variable and overlapping.

It also states:

Since the 1960s, there have been nine major Australian droughts. The major drought periods of 1895-1903 and 1958-68 and the major drought of 1982-83 were the most severe in terms of rainfall deficiency...

This just shows that drought is not something new to this country. It is not something that we can attribute to climate change. It is part of the normal cyclic behaviour of our climate. As I have said in other speeches, our farmers have had to deal with this for decades and decades.

So, to think that for the last 10 or 20 years that this is all new to everybody is why people are so angry about this. People out there have a memory. They understand, they know and they remember that the Murray has been dry or in flood before—it is cyclic—and nothing we can do is going to change that. How arrogant are we to believe that we can control the climate?

I could go on and on, as I have, about this issue, but I will not go on for too much longer because, at the end of the day, debates are never won or lost in this place based on solid science. Depending on the issue, party politics is what wins out, and that is how we contribute to the gradual degradation of our democracy and our political system.

The best thing to say on this issue is that the people know that they are being conned. The people know they are being sacrificed for the sake of the few who will make the money on the carbon market and they are more than angry about it.

To all political parties who serve this agenda I say keep up the good work, because it will be the demise of your party in the long run. People have had enough of being seen as cash cows for government. Climate change is a solution to government's problem of not being able to control every facet of existence of the people. The carbon tax fraud has seen the political

death of two prime ministers—Kevin Rudd and Julia Gillard—and apparently when sleazy politics and spin fail we can roll out the big guns, namely our celebrities, to put it all into perspective for us poor sods, we climate sceptics, climate deniers or global warming heretics, who are so lacking in the ability to think for ourselves that we would be easily mesmerised by the rich and famous. Even that failed to convince the majority.

I suggest that we mortals get over ourselves and deal with the pollution of this planet in real terms rather than some mythical problem that will cost us and this country dearly and solve none of the problems of government being influenced, if not ruled, by the corporate world of global financial money gobblers who have an insatiable appetite for everybody else's hard-earned money.

This planet will survive long after the human race has been eradicated through selfishness, greed and lack of respect for the world we are supposed to care for and about. We are focused on convincing people to reduce the population in order to solve world hunger, but if in fact governments had a refocus of priorities we could in fact make a huge difference to the issues that face the people of this world, the starving people of this world.

Environmentalism has been taken over by the Green Nazis. Let us be clear: this planet is polluted and it is not because of average Joe, who goes about—

The Hon. M. Parnell interjecting:

The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON: —I wasn't talking about you—the average Joe who goes about the business of living in a world created by government policies that support big industry rather than the public good. That is our problem, not how much carbon dioxide we release into the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is not the problem, as has been demonstrated over and over again and then ignored. The problem we face is the pollution of our land, air and water through chemicals that are released by big industry and allowed to do so by our environmental protection agencies worldwide which do little more than support government in protecting the real offenders.

Man-made climate change or industry pollution: there is a big difference in how that challenge should be met. We are not having any debate on the efficacy of the use of thorium and I can also guess as to why not. While we sit here and argue over man-made climate change—and if the Greens were to have their way we would be back in the Dark Ages, living in caves and rediscovering the use of fire all over again—China is leading the way in technology that has been around since the 1960s and then literally abandoned. Less waste, less risk, less pollution, no emissions, but we remain stuck arguing about coal pollution that could quite easily be eradicated. Then we blame average Joe for using the only technology that is available to him.

I do believe that the Hon. Mark Parnell has raised an important issue and I also believe that the scientific critical analysis of The Critical Decade report should be an important feature in this debate. As for calling on this state government to intensify its efforts to respond to the challenge of climate change, I say that all the science must be considered and a metered approach that includes all the information is necessary if we are to find a way forward. I also put on the record that information selection in order to prove an argument has destroyed people's faith in science altogether and this kind of manipulation and propaganda must stop if we are ever truly going to move forward in the best interests of the people of this planet and the planet itself.

Clean green solutions are not so clean and green at the end of the day. Wind power is limited in the amount of energy it produces and now there are reports of farmers having to walk off their farms because of the EMFs that are produced from the turbines and are making them

and their families ill, not to mention the limitations for producing affordable power to meet baseload requirements.

Solar energy is a great individual approach that is only an option for those who can afford it and I believe is an option that should be expanded with the ongoing assistance of government to ensure that those in the lower socioeconomic belt—which, by the way, is rising every day—can be assisted to do their bit. We hear all the advertisements about natural gas being a clean green alternative and ignore environmental damage to our land, air and water through the practice of coal seam gas mining, otherwise known as fracking.

How much hypocrisy are the people supposed to endure? I suggest that every member of this and the other place watch the low budget documentary known as *GASLAND* available on YouTube for download. If that does not raise serious concerns about what is happening in order to market 'clean green energy', then we are not fit people to be making any contribution to any debate on climate change, pollution or any other topic about the wellbeing of our environment and our people.

In other words, it is time to stop the rot and find solutions without any political agendas; that would be very difficult to do. We may all find that the truth will set us free indeed. I agree with the sentiments expressed in the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion because I, like so many others, am concerned about the health of the environment, knowing well that pollution causes damage to all life forms, including humans, and that a balance must be found that allows us all to live in a clean, safe environment without having to regress to the past.

There is a middle ground, and that can be revealed through examining best practice in all aspects of the provision of energy and industry. If they must be dragged kicking and screaming to the discussion and forced to comply with standards that do not compromise the health of the people or the planet for financial gain, then so be it. Drag them to the table. That is our battle—consequences for actions—and the government should leave average joe alone in the meantime until it is better prepared to offer true leadership, rather than just another fundraising exercise to strip the people of any extra money they may be lucky enough to have through hard work and effective financial management.

I do support the motion of the Hon. Mark Parnell as it is written but I do not support any efforts to further advance an unrealistic and unscientific approach to restoring our environment and the health of the people who are adversely affected by the ongoing support of the polluters of our air, water and land in the ongoing struggle to seek renewable clean green energy sources from a limited perspective.

Biofuel is adding to world hunger. While maize is being diverted to biofuel, it is adding to the food shortage in Somalia and other places. We need to think long and hard. As the saying goes, for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Looking at this issue from one narrow perspective is not doing us or the world or the planet any good at all.