

LETTERS

Finkel's energy blueprint fails the sceptics' test

The Australian, 12:00AM June 13, 2017

Congratulations to William Kininmonth for his outstanding article in which he demolishes the whole basis of the so-called emission targets on which the Finkel report is based ("Blueprint's author didn't ask about the weather", 12/6). The key disciplines upon which scientifically reputable investigations of the climate can be based are physics, chemistry, geology and astronomy.

Like many climate scientists, Alan Finkel's qualification in electrical engineering and some postdoctoral qualification in neuroscience is unqualified in any of the above subjects.

How this man comes to be proposing a report on a matter vital to our industrial future is a question to which only our leaderless federal government could provide an answer.

John Stone, Lane Cove, NSW

William Kininmonth's authoritative summary demolishing the case for dangerous climate change undercuts Australia's attachment to the Paris accord and the validity of the proposals by the Chief Scientist's report on the future of the national electricity market. To ignore the implications of what Kininmonth has said would be an act of economic sabotage on a monumental scale, outmatching the history of economic destruction by both parties over the past decade.

The federal and state governments have a duty to take account and respond to Kininmonth's challenge. As he rightly observes: "A misplaced objective of emissions reduction at the expense of affordable and reliable electricity services will unnecessarily impoverish Australians." We don't deserve such a fate.

Barry Maley, Crows Nest, NSW

After waiting a considerable time for Chief Scientist Alan Finkel to produce a blueprint for the electricity market, we find it's a damp squib. Worse, it offers what would not be a market but a group of suppliers subject to rules determined by bureaucratic futurologists who judge what effect our coal-fired generators would have on climate, and then determine how many should be scrapped.

That such judgments could be made when Australia produces about 1.4 per cent of global emissions, when China and India are allowed any increase in emissions to 2030, and the US now joins them is ridiculous.

Finkel must be joking when he claims the new clean energy target with high-cost renewable of 42 per cent by 2030 would reduce prices. For prices to then fall would require huge subsidies to persuade investments in wind and solar farms. How could Malcolm Turnbull possibly say that the blueprint has "merit"?

Des Moore, South Yarra, Vic

Critics of the Finkel report should at least give credit for the most subtle Trojan horse of recent times — the need for renewables to supply their own back-up power and to guarantee 24/7 supply. This will apportion the costs and carbon dioxide emissions of back-up power to renewables where it belongs, exposing the lie that they are zero emissions and low cost.

Hopefully, our political masters will have read Bill Kininmonth's article and let the market do its thing.

Doug Hurst, Chapman, ACT

The idea that by penalising power production from coal will lead to cheaper electricity is laughable. Coal is the most economic means of producing electricity, so any penalty on such production must

lead to higher prices. The proposed system will increase the cost of power, and by funnelling money into renewables make them appear to be economic.

It is in Australia's best interest to produce cheap electricity for both industrial and domestic reasons.

Brian C. Povey, Churchlands, WA

I endorse William Kininmonth in highlighting how little science is contained within the Finkel review. Our energy future appears destined to be one of high-cost dimness, foisted on us by policy dimwits. Their first act was to appoint a climate alarmist to conduct an energy review. Then they signed up for the Paris accord.

Next they show ignorance of the fact that despite having 25,000 wind turbines turning occasionally, Germany has failed to reduce its CO2 emissions, compared with the US which has reduced emissions by increasing fracking and the use of gas.

There is no warming from increasing CO2, only a greening of the world with higher food production. We owe it to future generations to stay with the cheapest and most reliable forms of energy — coal and gas.

G. M. Derrick, Sherwood, Qld