

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Amendment to Motion

Resumed from 31 May on the following motion moved by Hon J.A. Scott -

That the House notes the implications of the rapid rise of greenhouse gas emissions on the Western Australian ecosystems, human population and economy and supports any measures intended to reduce these emissions and their impacts.

to which the following amendment was moved by Hon Christine Sharp -

and calls on the Government to formulate and begin implementation of a state greenhouse strategy within six months from the date on which this motion is passed

HON M.J. CRIDDLE (Agricultural) [4.05 pm]: The other day just prior to the adjournment of the debate, I indicated that I would make some points about the previous Government's methods of overcoming some of the greenhouse emission problems and some other useful methods. I also indicated that I would take the opportunity to look at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation's report titled "Climate Change - Projections for Australia" and bring some balance to the argument. I agree that we must be well aware of the need to support any measures intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and their impact.

I refer to a report headed "Methods used to prepare the ranges of projected future change in Australian region temperature and precipitation". This report was compiled to describe the methods used to construct ranges of temperature and rainfall change presented in the "CSIRO, 2001", the latest statement on climate change projections for the Australian region. The full range of projected global warming provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 was combined with projected regional changes obtained from the nine climate models. The aim was to quantify ranges of uncertainty where possible. The steps involved and the methods used involved preparing ranges of projected global warming, choosing a set of climate models from which the regional climate change information would be obtained, extracting the regional climate change pattern from those models and combining the regional information with the global warming projections.

Some of the projected global warmings range from 1990 to 2100 and allow for the full range of the latest IPCC greenhouse gas and sulfate aerosol emission scenarios, plus variations across a range of climate models in their global average response to enhanced greenhouse conditions. The IPCC's projected warnings were not based directly on the output of atmosphere-ocean global climate models; they were obtained from the output of a highly simplified climate model tuned to mimic the behaviour of a more complex scenario. In choosing the set of climate models from which the global climate change information was obtained, patterns of climate change for the Australian region were readily obtainable from global and climatic model situations. Typically, there are significant differences between the models with regard to climate changes simulated at the regional scale, particularly for precipitation. Thus, to represent this uncertainty, a range of model results should be used in preparing the regional projections.

There are some uncertainties in this report and a very wide range of scenarios have been used. A media release from the CSIRO titled "More droughts, more flooding rains" reported that according to the CSIRO's latest climate change estimates, Australia would be hotter and drier in coming decades. The media release reported, "Rising concentrations of greenhouse gases are the culprit". It also reported, "Warmer conditions will produce more extremely hot days and fewer cold days". It went on to say that for most of the continent -

average temperatures will be 0.4 to 2°C greater than 1990 by 2030. By 2070, average temperatures are likely to increase by 1 to 6°C. The temperature ranges quoted indicate the scientific uncertainty associated with the projections.

The warming won't be the same everywhere . . .

These comments were made by Dr Peter Whetton of the department of atmospheric research at the CSIRO. He continued -

There will be slightly less warming in some coastal areas and Tasmania, and slightly more warming in the north-west.

Further down he said -

A better understanding of the likely impacts of climate change can contribute to adaptation strategies designed to minimise adverse impacts and optimise benefits . . . Natural ecosystems most at risk are coral reefs, alpine ecosystems, mangroves and wetlands. Also under threat are tropical forests, savannas, deserts and native grasslands.

There is a huge range of options on how to measure the impact that may take effect over the years. The CSIRO pamphlet titled "Climate Change Projections for Australia" reported that -

Greenhouse gas levels in the atmosphere have increased over the past 200 years due to human activities.

It continued -

Australia warmed by 0.7°C from 1910-1999, with most of this increase occurring after 1950.

Further down it states -

Scientists expect that continued increases in greenhouse gas levels will lead to further global warming and regional climate change.

Under the heading "Global warming and sea-level rise" the report states -

Allowing for uncertainty in future emissions of greenhouse gases and the response of the climate system, scientists have calculated that the Earth's average surface temperature . . . rise by 1.4 to 5.8°C by the year 2100 relative to 1990. This is a warming rate of 0.1 to 0.5°C per decade.

There is a substantial difference between 0.1 degrees and 0.5 degrees when the whole scenario is examined.

Under the heading "Australian climate change", the report continued -

Using climate model simulations, CSIRO has estimated future changes in Australian temperature, rainfall and evaporation. The estimates take into account uncertainties associated with the range of future global warming and the range of regional climate model responses.

The trend is for rainfall to decrease in the south west from minus 20 per cent to plus five per cent. The trend continues through the south east and Queensland. The report continued -

Decreases are most pronounced in winter and spring. Some inland and eastern coastal areas may become wetter in summer, and some inland areas may become wetter in autumn.

The report contains many ifs and mayes. The measurement of these impacts and the preparation of the reports must be done carefully. I do not doubt that there is a need for people to be aware of these issues. I will go through some of the methods that could be used to overcome what may be a real danger in the future. There is no doubt concerning problems like salinity in the wheatbelt. Under the heading "Evaporation and moisture balance" the CSIRO report said -

Warmer conditions will lead to increased evaporation.

That must be accepted if warming occurs to the extent anticipated. The report continued -

Tropical cyclone . . . may increase by 5-20% by the end of the century. Regions of cyclone origin are likely to remain unchanged. The number of severe oceanic storm surges in the north may rise as the intensity of tropical cyclones increases. Projected rises in sea-level would exacerbate this effect.

Interestingly it says -

El Nino and La Nina events have a strong influence on climate variability in many parts of Australia, and this will continue. Climate models do not give a consistent indication of future changes, but the drying associated with El Ninos may be enhanced by global warming.

I took the opportunity to go through this report and to take out some of those issues. I have expressed the wide range of options that are available through the report. I do not think I have taken a biased view of the report; it is the reality of the research that has been done. A balanced view of the environment is needed into the future. I am aware that the impacts of salinity and the like are serious in country areas. However, opportunities are available. I understand that Hon Jim Scott mentioned tax concessions, which is a ready way to assist some people. However, to get a tax concession one must actually make a profit. The wellbeing of both business and the future environment must be considered when the Government looks to overcome some of these problems, so that they can go hand in hand. If trees are planted, the best scenario is to make a profit from those trees - a benefit is needed. Tree plantations require fences, and conservation must be maintained. Perhaps there is some benefit in the taxation system, but that is not the total answer. A profit must be associated with it to enable farms or industries to operate, so that these mechanisms can be put in place.

When the coalition Government sold Westrail Freight there was a lot of talk about getting rid of the "family farms", so to speak. I have not heard a word of opposition since Westrail Freight was sold. The real benefit to come out of that is that the Government no longer has to put money into Westrail Freight, although it is continually saying that it has no money for the projects that it has in hand. It must find extra money for them. If they had to find money for -

Hon J.A. Scott: Even though you sold Westrail?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: Hon Jim Scott should ask the Government. The point is that the Government was expending something like \$100 million on Westrail, as Hon Jim Scott would know. I am only putting facts in front of people. People can make up their own minds about this report. I wanted to get some balance into the discussion because we must go forward from here. The point about Westrail was that the Government was losing money and there was no money to build the rail infrastructure in Western Australia. By putting it into private hands, there is a genuine opportunity for business to benefit and to build and grow. People should have recognised that opportunity earlier. I think a lot of people have recognised that since the sale. The mining industry out in the east is happy with the arrangement.

Another exciting area is the generation of power with hydrogen fuel cells. I have been involved in this project with DaimlerChrysler in Germany since 1996. An arrangement was signed at the end of last year for Western Australia to become involved in the research project. Three buses will be trialed here as soon as they become available. Hydrogen has great benefits as a fuel. Water is the only emission from the fuel cell. Hydrogen can be extracted from aquifers. One method is that it can be distilled off the top and carbon dioxide can be pumped back into the aquifer. Hydrogen is also the by-product of a Perth refinery, from which something like 40 tonnes of hydrogen is available. It may need to be refined further to get a clean gas for fuel cells, but it is certainly an option. The arrangement with BP by the previous Government to put the infrastructure in place provides the opportunity to bring those buses into the system here. I have seen them working in the commercial bus systems in Canada and the United States.

Hon J.A. Scott: Does Hon Murray Criddle know that water vapour is a greenhouse gas?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I listened to Hon Jim Scott speak for quite some time on this matter, and I am putting forward some options that will be of real benefit to people in the future.

Hon J.A. Scott: I am not criticising what Hon Murray Criddle is saying, just asking if he is aware that water vapour is a greenhouse gas.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: There is a downside to everything, but this is one of the very best options available. The previous Government was also looking at compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas as options for the bus fleet in Perth. Tests on those two gases were being run. They have the same sort of emissions. Compare this with diesel - Euro II and Euro III engines are very clean in their emissions, and there is some real benefit in them. The stage has been reached at which comparisons between diesel and other fuels produce very little difference in emissions, although in one case the emissions are particulates, and in the other greenhouse gases. It is a matter of which emissions are chosen.

I will turn to the issue of salinity in agricultural regions. There is certainly a need to overcome this problem, but the whole of the community needs to be involved in projects such as drainage, banks and trees. That is not enough, and some sort of pumping method will have to be developed, whereby the excess water is used. There is an enormous amount of water just under the surface in the wheatbelt, which may be able to be desalinated and used in other industries. Another option is salt-water aquaculture.

Nobody should be of the opinion that production is falling in the wheatbelt. The best indicators I am aware of are the local wheat bins and sidings. I did some research in my area. In 1988, about 40 000 tonnes of grain went into the local receival point. Last year the figure was in the order of 160 000 tonnes. This figure does not result from extra acreages, but from improvement in production in areas already being farmed. Production has been improved by using a minimum tillage system, involving direct drilling, which I use on my own property. Farmers in my area use about one-quarter of the fuel they used to use. The research that has brought us to a situation in which less fuel is used to produce more grain and other produce, has been outstanding. A lot of work has been done to overcome erosion and emissions - areas that are of concern, as is revealed in this report. An enormous amount of work has been done in these areas. The previous Government was taking on the challenge to overcome the greenhouse effect. I know it is a real problem, but we need to be realistic and recognise that we must produce for the future as well as overcome some of the problems in these areas. It is a very serious question and I welcome the opportunity to make some comments, but a balanced view is necessary. In the light of the amendment that has been put forward to this motion, I look forward to hearing what the present Government might do.

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan) [4.25 pm]: I am speaking on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition in this matter. I was grateful for the matters raised by Hon Murray Criddle. He picked up the fact that the consequences of the build-up of greenhouse gases are not universally accepted.

Hon J.A. Scott: We cannot possibly know the consequences.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is right - we do not know. The important point is that people who believe that the increase in greenhouse gases will lead to a change in temperature are not necessarily universally agreed with. Even those who agree that a change in temperature will occur do not necessarily agree on what the consequences of that change will be. A very substantial body of scientific opinion quite vociferously opposes what is seen as the accepted view of the effect of the increase in greenhouse gases.

Hon J.A. Scott: I would not say "substantial". That group is quite small.

Hon PETER FOSS: I have searched the Internet, which is one of those terrible globalised entities. At least 15 550 respectable scientists signed a petition disagreeing with the greenhouse effect.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is a very small group.

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes, a small group of 15 550 scientists who have vociferously opposed the greenhouse effect.

Hon J.A. Scott: Most of them are not climate scientists.

Hon PETER FOSS: I do not necessarily agree with that. One of the most interesting things about climate science is that it is impossible to predict whether it is going to rain this afternoon, but it is assumed that it is possible to predict that sea levels will rise around the world by a significant amount. I am by no means suggesting that we should not pay attention to warnings about gloom and doom, but I would hate members of this House to gain the impression that it is an open and shut case, firstly, that global warming will happen and, secondly, what the consequences of that warming will be. A substantial body of opinion queries the greenhouse effect. That does not mean that we quietly and comfortably go about our lives ignoring this point, but I would like to place quite clearly on the record that it is still a matter of considerable scientific contention.

I also draw attention to the insignificance of humans in the long term. It is very important to us what happens in the short term, but when I was Minister for Water Resources I can remember attending a very good seminar given by a climate expert, who pointed out, from the scientific evidence of the past, the changes in weather patterns and the amount of precipitation, particularly in Western Australia. He was able to show the fractal changes. Over a period of 1 000 years there will be significant variations up and down, and after a time precipitation always returns to a certain level. This seminar, at the CSIRO, was organised in response to 20 years of drought in Western Australia, which not many people are aware of. For 20 years the rainfall had been substantially lower than in previous recorded history. The Government was concerned about this, especially since, as Minister for Water Resources, I was concerned about whether there would be enough water for people to drink in Western Australia. This expert pointed out to me that, over a period of 100 years, I could be safely assured that the level of rainfall would return to the average level. I said that I could just imagine going to the people of Western Australia at the next election and saying that there may not be enough water to drink now, but if they wait 100 years, things would return to normal. The fact is that very major differences occur over geological, and even historical, times. The conditions that we assume to be normal now and with which we work will change. Members are at the moment encamped in a Parliament House, which sits on a coastal plain. We can step outside and look at what we call the Darling Range, but we know it is not the Darling Range at all, it is the Darling escarpment. There was a time when where we are now was the sea. The sandy coastal plain was formerly a seabed and the waters of the Indian Ocean lapped against the foot of the Darling scarp. That was not caused by greenhouse gas emissions but by the standard variations that occur during geological time. Rottneest was at one stage a nice little reef underneath the sea. If members go to Fitzroy Crossing they will find two very interesting stations there called Gogo and Fossil Downs. The reason for Fossil Downs' name is that it has huge lumps of rock which, if looked at more closely, can be seen to have constituted part of a Devonian reef; the station is one of the richest sources of Devonian material to be found in the world. Next door at the Gogo station the famous Gogo fish fossil was found. Members will no doubt recall vividly that the previous Government adopted the State's fossil emblem. Hon Norman Moore will definitely remember that because -

Hon Tom Stephens: Being a great fossil himself.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, he was one of the first ministers to whom representations were made by the then Sutherland Primary School - now the Sutherland Dianella Primary School - which carried out an excellent public exercise in urging the State to adopt a fossil emblem. I had the privilege of attending a presentation of the school's work and was most impressed by the wonderful efforts of the pupils in urging the State to adopt a fossil emblem. They had not only done all the research on whether WA should have a fossil emblem, but also had chosen one. If I remember correctly, it was called *McNamaraspis kaprios*. In due course the State decided to adopt that emblem and a scientific committee confirmed that fossil fish as the state fossil emblem.

The point I am trying to make in this instance is that if members are concerned about the raising and lowering of water and sea levels, I say to them that it has occurred before to a considerably greater degree than is contemplated by the worst scenarios in this greenhouse gas emissions discussion. I suggest that members

occasionally get their views in perspective. We have become so enormously concerned with seeing everything in terms of our current situation that we occasionally lose sight of the fact that many things occur over geological and historical times which would make vast differences to the lives we would live if we were to continue to live in this State.

One interesting point is that ice ages occur regularly. One of our major Australian icons, Uluru - I shall use that term in deference to the minister opposite - is a direct product of an ice age. Uluru was left behind by an ice age, and I believe, although I am unsure of its origin, that Mt Augustus may very well have been too, as it is the largest monolith in Western Australia. Frequently, variations in climate are created purely by natural causes, and the variations that occur when those sorts of cycles occur leave completely in the shade the climatic changes caused by greenhouse gas.

Hon J.A. Scott: You are saying that the Liberal Party is still hedging its fences and will not do anything about it.

Hon PETER FOSS: Hon Jim Scott did not hear what I said. I am happy to start at the beginning again and refresh his memory of what I said because I have unlimited time. What I said, Mr Scott, was that we should take it a little in context, not that we should ignore it. I shall tell him later why I believe it is even more important to take into account the context when referring to the proposal in this motion. What I am saying, Mr Scott -

The PRESIDENT: Order! I know the Greens (WA) have indicated that they are not honourable, but they should be referred to appropriately. It is Hon Jim Scott.

Hon PETER FOSS: Hon Jim Scott - actually, I think it should be in the vocative - Oh, Hon Jim Scott. I always have problems when dealing with the vocative of honourable. I know how to refer to people in the nominative and accusative, but the vocative is extremely difficult. However, Hon Jim Scott, the difficulty we have is that we wish to put a little level of seriousness into the hysteria that has occurred in debate on this motion. I point out to the Greens, especially so that the Chamber understands, that the Liberal Party does believe the matter should be taken seriously. We believe there are very sound reasons for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but they are not necessarily related to climatic change. However, we believe people should get a hold of themselves occasionally and work out the fact that significant changes occur as a matter of course, and are happening in any event, whether or not we add greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. Scientific opinion does not accept universally that the consequences that the Greens foresee will happen. That is my preliminary statement.

Why do I believe that we should take it seriously? There are good reasons for implementing some of the recommendations on climatic change. Those reasons have nothing to do with climatic change but have to do with an important reduction in the amount of energy we consume. Reducing the amount of energy we consume in itself is a very sensible move. I greatly believe in the old saying "waste not, want not". It happens to be a sound rule of economics and is also a sound rule of the environment.

Hon Tom Stephens: It is a pity you didn't apply it in government.

Hon PETER FOSS: We did.

Hon Tom Stephens: No, you didn't.

Hon PETER FOSS: The great charter-flight person should know better than anybody else should how much we stopped waste. I will not go into the waste that we stopped in the area of charter flights, but I know how intensely interested the member is in charter flights. I will no doubt ask him about them at some stage because he appears to be thoroughly interested in flying around the State all the time.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is my job.

Hon PETER FOSS: I believe it. He is the minister for joy rides around the State.

Hon Tom Stephens: My job is to serve the electorate. I will give you a response. It is actually to make sure that the people in the regional areas get a say and I would have hoped that I had the support, if not of your party, at least of the Greens.

Hon N.F. Moore: Is your job to serve the electorate or to serve the Government?

Hon PETER FOSS: Or to serve his party. Mr President, I am being very naughtily diverted from my intention of speaking on the motion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members are actually ignoring the speaker now.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: On the contrary, it is a very diverted speech.

Hon PETER FOSS: I thank the member very much indeed. I believe the maxim "waste not, want not" is not only a sound economic rule but also one that people who are economically minded, like me, can follow. In industry, farming and any form of business, "waste not, want not" is a very sensible maxim. If people ensure that everything they expend is properly used and they do not expend any more than they need to, they will in fact

want not; that is, they will not lack the necessaries. It is also a sensible environmental maxim. I believe that most sound environmental measures are also sound economic measures. I see no inconsistency between the two. If we do not waste the resources of this earth, we will not want for the resources of this earth. Most of the pollution and problems of our cities and our nation are caused by waste. The sorts of measures referred to by Hon Murray Criddle, for instance, the hydrogen-driven fuel cell buses would achieve the aim of not wasting. It would have a positive environmental effect.

Hon Dee Margetts: I can see that is why you ordered diesel buses.

Hon PETER FOSS: One of the problems of Hon Dee Margetts coming in halfway through the debate is that she missed the initial argument. Therefore, I will diverge to tell her why the coalition Government ordered diesel buses. We looked at the scientific evidence. We found that Euro II and Euro III buses had a better environmental record than gas-powered buses. If the Greens (WA) bothered to check the scientific basis, they would know that gas is an atrociously wasteful method of doing things. It sounds nice and the Greens love gas, but Euro II and Euro III are better. However, the coalition Government did not stop at the best engine at the time, which was Euro II and ultimately Euro III; Hon Eric Charlton and Hon Murray Criddle investigated an even better method, which is the fuel cell. Unfortunately, Hon Dee Margetts was not a member of this place at that stage, she was somewhere else. The reality of the matter is that the members of this Chamber who were members at that time had the privilege of riding on a fuel cell bus to see what it was like. I am grateful to Hon Murray Criddle for arranging that. Hon Dee Margetts missed that opportunity, the scientific basis, the logic, the argument and the conference of world experts. It is all a matter of faith for the Greens. One of the problems with arguing with the Greens is that it does not matter that people look at the scientific evidence, check everything and come up with the facts; if it is not an article of faith with the Greens, they do not believe the facts. The facts are irrelevant; it is a matter of faith. It is the green religion.

Waste not, want not is a sound economic and environmental process. Properly done, the combination of doing the best thing economically can also be the best environmentally; and the best thing environmentally can also be the best economically. I do not see an inconsistency between good environmental practices and good economics. They do mesh. I fully support all the measures that are proposed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, because they make sound sense in every possible way. Why should we have inefficient electronic motors? Why should we have inefficient diesel and petrol fuel motors? Why should we have inefficient coal-fired power stations if there is a better way to use the resources of the earth? Not everything "green" is instantly a better way of doing things environmentally. The classic example is a tidal power station. That has serious economic and environmental problems. No matter what we do, if we take energy out of the environment, we are taking energy out of an ecosystem.

When the tidal power project was first suggested, one of the concerns I had as a former environment minister, was that the dynamism and the kinetic energy put into coastal mangrove flats by tide is a very important part of that ecosystem. If we remove the kinetic energy from that ecosystem, many things in that ecosystem will be affected. It is not a simple matter of saying it is free energy, so let us take it and use it. The reality is that it will impact on the environment; everything we do has an impact on the environment. Similarly, although I greatly support the use of wind power generators in Esperance, the reality is that has an impact on the local environment. Quite apart from the generation of noise, it has an impact by removing the kinetic energy that would otherwise flow over the land.

I have no simple suggestion. All too often the people who support the Greens grab ideas from here, there and everywhere, and instantly believe in them without following them to their source and finding out the reality. Although I support these things, they do not come without a cost. Similarly, with photovoltaic power, a considerable investment in energy is used to make the devices that generate the power. Admittedly, we are becoming more efficient and better at doing that. Sometimes what is not economic today in power terms becomes economic tomorrow. For instance, when I bought a Solahart hot water system it was not economical. The cost of a Solahart was so much greater than the cost of a simple gas heater, that the initial cost could not be recovered over a reasonable period. However, with time and the increase in the price of fuel and the fact that sunlight is free, a solar hot water has become extremely economical and worthwhile, even if the sacrificial anodes must continue to be replaced. Things do change, and just because a particular technology may not be environmentally positive at the moment, does not mean that further research and work will not turn it into an environmental positive.

The Opposition definitely supports the measures by which the emission of greenhouse gases will be reduced. It is an excellent idea. We definitely support measures that save on the expenditure of energy. Who needs to challenge that? Both are eminently economic and environmentally sensible measures. However, I have a slight problem with the particular way in which this idea has been implemented on an international basis. I will refer members to two documents. The first is called the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change which was agreed to in 1992. I will table these documents, because we have been talking about Kyoto and all

these other things. It is a lovely document, and I wonder how many people have read these conventions. The other document is the Kyoto Protocol. The original convention was held in Berlin. It was followed up with a more specific protocol in Kyoto. I do not know how many members have read either of these documents. That is funny; I did not get an interjection. I thought I would get a chorus of "We have" from the Greens.

Hon Dee Margetts: I was at the Kyoto conference, if that is what you are asking.

Hon PETER FOSS: Has Hon Dee Margetts read the protocol?

Hon Dee Margetts: I did skim through it, yes.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is a good start; that is excellent. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol are interesting, because of the figures that have been bandied around. One is that the United States is responsible for 36 per cent of the total carbon dioxide emissions in the world. We keep hearing that. Hon Dee Margetts would not say that, because having been at Kyoto she would be aware that it is inaccurate. Those figures relate only to the annex I parties. As members might be aware, there are two annexes to the United Nations framework on climate change. The countries referred to in annex I include Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, European Economic Community, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Interestingly, there are just a few omissions from that list. A few of the obvious omissions include China and India, which have two-thirds of the world's population. The signatories to the convention are mentioned in annex I, but two-thirds of the world's population are not included.

Hon Simon O'Brien: What about the US?

Hon PETER FOSS: It is in the list.

Hon E.R.J. Dermer: It is grossly exaggerated.

Hon PETER FOSS: Does the member not think those countries have two-thirds of the world's population?

Hon Sue Ellery: What is their production of greenhouse gas?

Hon PETER FOSS: It is not in here and that is the important point. There is a bit of a supposition about that. China, India, Mexico, Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Egypt, Brazil - it is interesting that Brazil is not on the list, because a meeting was later held in Rio de Janeiro - and Taiwan are not on the list. The problem with the accuracy of those figures, and how one should take a little care with them, is the fact that India and China are not mentioned. I do not know how many people have been to either India or China -

Hon Dee Margetts: I bet you have.

Hon PETER FOSS: I have, as it happens. When I was a lawyer, and before I entered this place, I went to China twice. Although I would not by any means claim to know all about China as a result of those trips, one thing that absolutely and completely struck me about China was the emission of greenhouse gases. I have never been to such a place. It belches coal smoke. I went to a place called Anshan, which was the largest steel city in China at that stage. I got there in the middle of the night and when I woke up in the morning, pulled the curtains and looked out, all I could see were chimneys. All I could see was smoke coming out of every chimney - and that is just from the houses, not the steelworks.

Hon J.A. Scott: You obviously did not have the presidential suite.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, but I hope some time to go back as a member of Parliament.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: We hope you do, too!

Hon PETER FOSS: I do not think the Anshan hotel had a presidential suite. It was an old-style Russian hotel.

Hon N.F. Moore: However, if it had, we would find that Hon Tom Stephens had already been there.

Hon PETER FOSS: I would need to ensure that I did not go at the same time as Hon Tom Stephens, who would definitely make sure he got the presidential suite.

Hon Tom Stephens: I do not have a passport.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am not surprised it was taken from him. After his last performance overseas it was the only safe thing the Government could do.

Hon Tom Stephens: I travelled in the safe company of Hon Norman Moore, Hon Barry House and Hon George Cash, and whatever they did, I did and wherever they went, I went.

Hon Barry House: Straight into a hire car and to the presidential suite.

Hon PETER FOSS: The rest were left sitting around in the lobby. We have all heard the stories about travelling with Hon Tom Stephens. Do not is the message we got from that.

On the way back from my second trip I passed through Shanghai. I have only ever passed through Shanghai; I have never stayed there. I was at the airport watching planes take off. It was quite fascinating. A plane would taxi down the runway, lift off and 100 metres above the ground it would disappear. The reason it disappeared was there was so much coal smoke in the air that it was just impossible to see planes once they were more than 100 metres off the ground.

For members to gain an idea of the quantity of greenhouse gas produced by China and India, they should look at the Russian Federation, which has 17.4 per cent of the production of greenhouse gases of the parties listed in annex I. As well as that, there are all the other parts of the Russian Federation, or what used to be the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I can only guess the level of greenhouse gas produced by China and India, but whatever China's level of greenhouse gases is today, I can guarantee that in 10 years it will be one heck of a lot more, because China is increasing its production of greenhouse gases enormously. India also is massively increasing its industrial output, but not as much as China, so members should not forget India. A connection can also be made between a country's population and its use of greenhouse gases. The use is not as strong in places like India, for instance, because many people get around on bicycles or cows.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: There are over 500 million bicycles in China.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is very good, but people are rapidly changing to cars. I recall hearing one member of the Greens (WA) criticise the fact that those people are getting into cars, as if it is all right for westerners to drive around in cars, but because the Chinese are so good on their bicycles they should not be allowed into cars. There will be problems for China, but it is a bit of a paternalistic attitude to say that the Chinese should not be allowed to have cars and should stay on bicycles, even though it would be for the good of the world and for the Chinese if they did so.

Hon J.A. Scott: Are you sure you are not misquoting anybody?

Hon PETER FOSS: I had a problem with that, but I recall somebody on that side being a bit scathing of the fact that the Chinese are moving into cars.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: That was last year and they were members of your party.

Hon PETER FOSS: No; it was definitely this year and from someone on that side who was not too keen on the idea of the Chinese moving into cars. I am probably correct in saying that some members opposite do not like that idea. I would be very surprised if they did not take the attitude that the Chinese should stay on bicycles.

Hon Ken Travers: We are keen to encourage Western Australians to try not to use cars.

Hon N.F. Moore: He wants us to ride bicycles.

Hon PETER FOSS: Riding bicycles and walking is great. The point I am making is that the Kyoto Protocol omits from its compass some rather important parts of the world. Perhaps I should explain to the House the underlying nature of the deal that took place at Kyoto.

Hon Dee Margetts: This is disgraceful!

Hon PETER FOSS: What is? The deal at Kyoto? I will tell members what the underlying deal was at Kyoto. We have the old economies, and next to certain countries in the list in the framework is an "a". Those countries include Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation and Ukraine. The note next to the "a" at the bottom of the pages says -

Countries that are undergoing the process of transition to a market economy.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: That is nice to know.

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes, it is. If members want to know what the deal was, I will tell them: China, India and a number of other countries that traditionally were not great manufacturing countries are out of this deal. Obviously that is fair; they have not produced a lot in the past, they are behind the western countries in their economies and they need an opportunity to catch up, so they are not part of the deal. Two-thirds of the world's population is busily increasing its consumption of greenhouse gases without any limitation whatsoever under the protocol. That is how effective this protocol is: two-thirds of the world's population is allowed to go hell for leather to catch up on everybody else, and they do not have much by way of restrictions on either pollution or greenhouse gas emission. So much for this wonderful protocol which will secure our future - somebody is putting his thumb over a small hole in the dyke and water is pouring over the top in huge quantities. We will

keep our finger on the little hole in the dyke - in particular, Australia will keep its finger on its 2.1 per cent of the annex I production.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.