Liar, liar, your scheme's on fire
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SOME evenings ago, a complete stranger slapped me after I complained about his unleashed dog chasing my son and pinning him down in the playground where he fell.

Rather than spinning, blurry stars, the sharp slap on the face allowed me to see the truth more clearly than ever.

The stranger had claimed my child had chased his dog, not the other way around.

I, and half a dozen other witnesses who saw the unprovoked dog running after frightened children, told the stranger his account was 100 per cent wrong.

I was more gobsmacked at the dog owner's bald-faced lie in the face of overwhelming evidence than I was at being slapped for defending my child.

It was the first time in my life that I had ever been slapped and it was also the first time that I realised that even when the truth is irrefutable, some people can still deny it without blinking.

That's when I finally understood why the climate change debate in Australia had been so counter-productive -- too many deniers, too many greedy types telling lies about the costs to their bottom line of efforts to cut carbon emissions and too many politicians claiming their policies can achieve meaningful cuts to emissions cost-effectively, when in fact their policies will allow emissions to balloon.

As the late-November deadline approaches for a second parliamentary debate on the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme Bill, some of the deceptions have been revealed -- such as the huge shortfall in CPRS revenue.

This week, Treasurer Wayne Swan conceded that a number of factors, none of which can be explained away as unforeseeable, had led to a revision of Budget estimates of CPRS revenue.

In May, the CPRS was expected to be revenue neutral, but this week Mr Swan admitted the scheme was expected to impose a cumulative cost of about $2.5 billion by 2019-20.

It seems that no matter which way the numbers are crunched, the CPRS looks like a scheme where Peter is robbed to pay Paul with no real cuts to emissions for decades.

According to Treasury's "Australia's Low Pollution Future" document, Chart 3.6 shows Australia's emissions are projected to decline from 2033 -- a whole 24 years from today.

So, what is the purpose of the CPRS other than to create a lucrative cash flow for the financial sector that will inevitably manipulate carbon trading?
Simple: the purpose is to allow the import of as many permits from developing countries as possible, until some time way beyond 2050 when those responsible for drafting the CPRS will be dead anyway.

The reason emissions are projected to fall from 2033 is because Treasury has assumed clean coal technology will be available by then.

Believing in safe and cheap clean coal is like believing in fairies. There is no expert on the planet that will admit that coal can be inexpensively decarbonised, that all the carbon can be captured and transported safely and inexpensively and then stored somewhere safely and inexpensively forever. It just can't be done safely and cheaply.

To pretend otherwise is to distort the truth. But that seems to be quite fashionable at the moment, right?

Sadly, one expert who does want to shed some light on the truth is CSIRO scientist and economist Clive Spash.

In a paper the CSIRO is preventing from being published, Dr Spash argues that the CPRS is an ineffective way to cut emissions and that the Government should legislate mandatory emissions reductions or impose a carbon tax.

It is an indictment on the CSIRO that it will not release research that criticises the CPRS. What is the organisation afraid of, that the paper will recommend aggressive climate stabilisation policies?

That is exactly what Richard Howarth, of the US Dartmouth College -- an academic who the CSIRO cannot gag -- was scheduled to recommend at an ANU seminar last night.

Climate Change Minister Penny Wong should immediately use her influence to lift the gag on Dr Spash's paper so that we can better sort the facts from the CPRS lies.