ONE RELIGION IS ENOUGH

John Howard

The Global Warming Policy Foundation
2013 Annual GWPF Lecture
The Institution of Mechanical Engineers |
5 November 2013

GWPF REPORTS

Views expressed in the publications of the *Global Warming Policy Foundation* are those of the authors, not those of the GWPF, its Trustees, its Academic Advisory Council members or its Directors.

THE GLOBAL WARMING POLICY FOUNDATION

Director
Dr Benny Peiser

Assistant Director
Philipp Mueller

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Lord Lawson (Chairman)
Lord Donoughue
Lord Fellowes
Rt Rev Peter Forster
Bishop of Chester
Sir Martin Jacomb
Sir James Spooner
Baroness Nicholson
Lord Turnbull

ACADEMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Professor David Henderson (Chairman)
Adrian Berry
Sir Samuel Brittan
Sir Ian Byatt
Professor Robert Carter
Professor Vincent Courtillot
Professor Freeman Dyson
Christian Gerondeau
Dr Indur Goklany
Professor William Happer
Professor Terence Kealey
Professor Anthony Kelly
Professor Deepak Lal
Professor Richard Lindzen
Professor Ross McKitrick
Professor Robert Mendelsohn
Professor Sir Alan Peacock
Professor Ian Plimer
Professor Paul Reiter
Dr Matt Ridley
Sir Alan Rudge
Professor Nir Shaviv
Professor Philip Stott
Professor Henrik Svensmark
Professor Richard Tol
Dr David Whitehouse

One Religion Is Enough

John Howard

The Honourable John Howard
John Howard was Prime Minister of Australia from 1996 to 2007. He served as Treasurer from 1977 to 1983 and as Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs from 1975 to 1977.

Welcome Address

Dr Benny Peiser

Director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation

Dear Mr Howard

Distinguished Guests

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen

As the Director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation it is my great pleasure to welcome you to this year's Annual GWPF Lecture.

It is my particular honour to welcome John Howard, the former Prime Minister of Australia, who has travelled here from down under specificially to deliver the fourth Annual GWPF Lecture.

John Howard is no newcomer to the debate about global warming and what governments consider doing about it. In fact, he is one of the pioneers of climate policy - although his landmark advance is not widely known.

15 years ago, in 1998, the then Prime Minster John Howard established the Australian Greenhouse Office, which was the world's first government agency dedicated to cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

On the thorny issue of international climate policy, however, his position has been consistent throughout the years. In a foreword to one of our GPWF reports, John Howard wrote:

> I am an agnostic when it comes to global warming. That is why I had no difficulty in proposing in 2007, when I was Prime Minster of Australia, an emissions trading system, predicated on the rest of the world acting in a similar fashion, and designed to protect Australia's

trade-exposed industries.[1]

For many years green campaigners criticised his insistence on an international legally binding agreement. They pointed to Europe, where goverments had no hesitation whatsoever in burdening their countries with unilateral and therefore hugely expensive climate targets and policies.

Tonight, Mr Howard returns to London in the full knowledge that his principled opposition to go-it-alone policies has become the new consensus even among European Union member states that only a few years ago acclaimed their advant-garde approach.

In fact, the EU itself has now adopted the Howard doctrine, warning that the EU will not sign up to any new climate treaty that does not include major economies, not least China, India, the United States and others.

Ladies and gentlemen, the last year has seen a deepening crisis of British and international climate policies. All over Europe energy prices are going through the roof, fuel poverty is rising and costly green energy policies are facing a growing public backlash.

In Australia, Mr Howard's friend and colleague Tony Abbott became the new Prime Minister on the back of an election promise to abolish the hugely unpopular carbon tax. At the same time, the new government has abolished the Climate Change Department, the Climate Change Commission and other sections of the government's green bureaucracy.

John Howard was one of the first and foremost critics of the Kyoto Protocol that only required European and a few other nations to cut CO_2 emissions.

On 16 February 2005, the very day the Kyoto Protocol came into effect, John Howard reaffirmed Australia's opposition to what he called a 'useless' treaty and stressed that joining Kyoto would mean major nations including China, India, Indonesia and the United States would not be subject to the same economic restrictions Australia would face. That, he warned, would jeopardise Australian jobs and industry.

1 Ross McKitrick, 'What Is Wrong With The IPCC?', *The Global Warming Policy Foundation*, 2011, http://www.thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/mckitrick-ipcc_reforms.pdf

He was right all along. The Kyoto Protocl turned out to be a dead end. It expired unlamented at the end of last year without any legally binding follow-up treaty.

Yet for many years John Howard was criticised for his restrained approach to climate change. He has repeatedly condemned the intellectual bullying that has been a feature of the behaviour of some climate zealots. He has certainly not been intimidated, stressing, I quote:

> The attempt of many to close down the climate debate is disgracful and must be resisted.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming our distinguished speaker, the Honourable John Howard.

One Religion Is Enough

John Howard

Thank you very much, Dr Peiser, Lord Lawson, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank the Foundation for asking me to come to London to deliver this address. I do so with considerable enthusiasm, and I have deliberately chosen the title for the lecture 'One Religion is Enough' to highlight my belief that part of the problem with this debate is that to some of the zealots involved their cause has become a substitute religion. And although not given to agnosticism in other matters, I have for a long time been an agnostic on the issue of climate change or global warming, and I will use the expressions interchangeably to reinforce my agnosticism on the subject.

The other particular relevance of being able to deliver this lecture tonight is that, as Dr Peiser mentioned, we have just had a change of government in Australia. It has been a magnificent change of government and one that I welcome, not only for the obvious philosophical reason that we now have a sound centre-right government in charge in Australia, but also for the reason that the new prime minister is somebody for whom I have a very warm personal regard and we have been colleagues for a long time. He was a senior minister in my government and I think he will do an outstanding job.

But enough of that. The real significance is that, as Dr Peiser pointed out, a central issue in the election campaign was the different approach of Tony Abbott and the Liberal Party in Australia from that of the Labor Party on the issue of global warming. It is the case that had it not been for Tony Abbott seeking the leadership of the Liberal Party four years ago because he disagreed with the party pursuing a bipartisan agreement with the Labor government on the issue of climate change, we would probably still have a Labor government in Australia some four years later.

Tony Abbott's stance on climate change was central to his election campaign, but let me just traverse for a moment – before I turn to the Australian scene – on some of my broader views about this very important debate. One of the things that I have found most aggravating about the debate is the attempt by so many people who have a particularly zealous view on the issue to intimidate policymakers into compliance with their point of view, by asserting that this is not really an issue that is anything other than something to do with the science. We are constantly told that the science is in, the debate is over, there can be no further serious debate about the scientific propositions.

Now all of us, as common-sense individuals, know that the science is never completely in on any subject, and the whole basis of understanding the importance of science to our lives is that it is a source of information derived from intelligent inquiry; it is not a piece of political advocacy. We all know of examples where we believed that the science was in on something, only to discover later on that further research indicated that another point of view should prevail.

The issue of global warming is a public policy issue. The science is important – it is important to understand the science of the debate. It is important to understand the economics of the debate. And it is also important to understand that as public monies are involved the ground is thick with rent seekers who would like to have a share of that public money.

I'd like to read for you a quote from the *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, by Richard S. Lindzen, Emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who had something to say about the conjunction of science and political agendas, which I think is very relevant to this debate. He said of those with political agendas who found it useful to employ science:

> This immediately involves a distortion of science at a very basic level: namely science becomes a source of authority rather than a mode of inquiry. The real utility of science stems from the latter; the political utility stems from the former.

But in this debate the technique is used very heavily of asserting that science is almost above politics; that this is one of those things that should be determined by the experts. As a person who served 33 years in the Australian parliament and proud to have identified with the profession of politics all of my adult life, I accept that scientists are experts on science, that judges are experts in interpreting the law, that doctors are expert in keeping us healthy providing that we take their advice. But when it comes to public policymaking in a democracy, the elected politicians serving in parliament are the experts. They should be informed on the science, they should be mindful of the economics, but they should never surrender to others the right to make public policy. It never ceases to amaze me how many politicians bemoan the decline in the reputation of their profession, but at the same time are busily handing over to other people responsibility for the making of public policy.

My attitude on this is of a piece with my longstanding objection to bills of rights. I think there are three guarantors of liberty in our kind of society. The first of those is to have a robust political and parliamentary system. It may on occasions frustrate us, it may on occasions embarrass us, but there is no better alternative. We need an independent, incorruptible judiciary. And the third pillar we need is a free and highly sceptical press. If you have those three things, you have a democracy. I do not favour unelected judges determining social issues. I have enormous admiration for the United States and many things American, but that admiration does not extend to the way in which their constitution has allowed, over the years, countless sensitive social and other issues to be determined by unelected judges.

Global warming therefore is a quintessential public policy issue. It is important, in understanding the issue in its 2013 context, to understand the world in which we now live and the prospects we have for the advancement of mankind over the next few decades. According to McKinsey's 'Global Population Report'– and it was prepared for the UN and it therefore has a very respectable pedigree given that the IPCC is a body that operates under the auspices of the UN – according to that

report, prepared last year, by the year 2030 – that is just over 16 years from now – there will be 2.2 billion more middle-class consumers in the world than there are now, and 1.7 billion of that 2.2 billion will be in Asia. We are talking here of lifting close to a quarter of the world's population from the tyranny of poverty, through economic growth, in the short space of less than 20 years.

To me, it is hard to conceive of a more exciting prospect for the world than to bring that about. You may ask what is the relevance; what is the context this gives to the global warming debate? I think there's an immediate and compelling context for the global warming debate because nothing should be more important than lifting those billions of people out of poverty. The impact of any global warming policies on the economic growth that is needed to lift them from poverty is very relevant to the debate.

I think we would all agree that over the last five years the dynamic of the global warming debate has shifted very significantly, and there have been a number of reasons for this. The first reason has, of course, been the global financial crisis. And to borrow, if I may, Irvine Crystal's famous remark about being mugged by reality, the global financial crisis has certainly mugged the global warming debate with a heavy dose of reality. Not only has it forced some governments to cut the costs of extravagant alternative energy schemes, but because it has had an impact on world economic activity it has coincidently slowed the growth of greenhouse gas emissions in some countries, which has given some pause for people to reflect on the value of the responses they are taking.

The collapse of the Copenhagen summit was a very significant event, and one that had an enormous impact on the debate in my country. It was obvious to me that no serious attempt had been made before that summit to achieve a consensus between the US and the major emitters from the developing world. Without that the summit had absolutely no prospect of any kind of success because without a pre-summit understanding between the US and the major emitters that success was not going to occur. I think it highly unlikely that we will ever have

a compact between the US and the major emitters. It is true that in his State of the Union address, in February of this year, President Obama committed himself to a cap-and-trade approach. But I think we are now further away than we were some years ago to there being some compact between the developing nations and the US on global warming.

I think it is important to understand that despite what was said in the State of the Union address, there is a deep bipartisan opposition in the US towards entering into any kind of worldwide agreement on climate change. The Republicans tend to get all of the bad press on this; we should recall that in 1998, during the presidency of Bill Clinton, the American senate voted by 95 to 0 against entering into any worldwide agreement that did not embrace all of the major emitters.

It is fair to say that a country like China is important to all of us, and not least Australia because it is now our largest export market and has an avaricious appetite for the resources that providence has been kind enough to give us. But countries like China have watched western industrialised nations achieve the high per-capita GDP to which they now rightly aspire through energy uses presently condemned as harmful to the environment. In my view, they have no intention of denying themselves that energy use, which has so manifestly benefited the western world. Their single greatest goal is economic growth and development, and in the process the lifting of more millions of their population from the grip of poverty. I can understand and sympathise with that, and I would ask the rhetorical question, 'What right has the already affluent west to deny them, or indeed other countries in that situation, the opportunity to enjoy the sort of economic growth that has been so important to the affluence that we now enjoy?'

I think another factor in the change of attitude on the debate has, of course, been in a variety of ways the weakening of the authority of the IPCC. You have had the flood of emails from the University of East Anglia, the admitted errors regarding the Himalayan glaciers and you have also had some prize examples of people involved in the work of the IPCC admitting the nakedly political character of the agenda they now believe it pursues. Now I do not suggest that everybody involved in the

IPCC has embraced a political agenda, and I respect that there are many outstanding scientists who believe that they are doing very proper work of inquiry; I do not make a blanket condemnation. But some of you may be aware of Otto Edenhofer, co-chairman of the IPCC Working Group III and a lead author of the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report, released in 2007. He had this to say:

> One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore.

And revealing his real agenda he went on to say:

> One must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world's wealth by climate policy.

Now, that's hardly an impeccably impartial, well-developed scientific statement. And, of course, importantly and finally, the IPCC report most recently released contains a grudging admission that the warming process has been at a standstill for the last 15 years.

But perhaps even more important than any of these developments has been the technological change in the last 5 years. The extraction of oil and gas from shale has had an enormous impact on the American energy scene. It is a game changer in the true sense of that expression. As you all know, gas is cheaper than coal. Natural gas emits 45% less carbon dioxide than coal, and costs much less than currently available wind and solar power. In 2012, US emissions of carbon dioxide dropped to their lowest level in 20 years; 14% below their peak in 2007. I am sure, addressing a British audience, that the significance of shale to your country and to others will not be lost on any of you.

As I said in my opening remarks, I have been something of an agnostic on this issue since I first began to confront it in a serious way as prime minister, close to ten years ago now. I have never rejected, totally, the multiple expressions of concern from many eminent scientists, but the history of mankind has told me of his infinite capacity to adapt to changing circumstances of the environment in which he lives.

Most in this room will recall the apocalyptic warnings at the club of Rome some 40 years ago. They were experts; they predicted that the world would run out of resources to sustain itself. They were wrong. Tragically, food shortages still occur but sadly many, although not all of them, result from tyrants using starvation as a political weapon.

In Australia, in 2004, when my government was still in office, we produced a white paper on energy. In that white paper we rejected an emissions trading system; we refused to adopt a mandatory target of 20% of electricity being sourced from renewables by the year 2020 (which had been recommended to us by a government-appointed body in place of the then existing target of only 2.5%); we reaffirmed our opposition to the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and, most importantly, we said that investment in technology should have a higher priority than other measures in dealing with global warming.

Now it is interesting that two years on my government ran into what was really a 'perfect storm' on the issue of global warming. We ended up being far more heavily battered by the storm than our political opponents. To start with, drought, which has been with Australia since the beginning of time, lingered on in many states, particularly in eastern Australia. Severe water restrictions were being introduced in Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne, and we thought that drought was never going to end. The bushfire season started early – it often does start early and will start early again in the future – and then we had the report by Sir Nicolas Stern, which had been commissioned by the then British government. Stern came to Australia, I think at the invitation of people in the Australian Labor Party. We met and we talked and I listened to what he had to say. Then on top of that we had the release of the remarkable documentary called *An Inconvenient Truth,* which had been authored by Al Gore, to whom I will return in a moment.

The atmosphere at that time – and the political atmosphere – was certainly very conducive to people wanting something done about global warming. In late 2006/early 2007, the Australian economy was surging, unemployment was approaching a 30-year low and the budget was in very robust condition. We were approaching a position in which

we would have no net debt and we had produced our tenth budget surplus in a row. And my party's internal political research – political parties do a lot of internal political research, despite any denials to the contrary from time to time – revealed that such was the optimism of the Australian people about the economic state then that they virtually believed the economy ran itself. And although they had the view that the then government was better at managing the economy than the opposition, in a sense it almost did not matter because the economy was in such tremendous good health. In those circumstances it was not hard to persuade the public that something more could be done about global warming because, after all, we could afford it.

Our political opponents skilfully exploited this; they argued for ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. The reason we had resisted ratification was very simple. The way it was structured would have imposed burdens on our industries – like say aluminium – that wouldn't have been imposed on countries like China and Indonesia. For us to have ratified would have put us at a distinct disadvantage because it would have encouraged investment to bypass Australia and flow to these other countries.

So, they pressed for ratification. There was a joint taskforce established between the government, senior bureaucrats and the business community, and they recommended an emissions trading scheme. We agreed to embrace it because it proposed the protection of our trade-exposed industries and it was on the understanding, as was mentioned in the introduction, that we would only take it to fruition if there were a worldwide understanding.

But that did not shift the view of the Labor party, who had a more fashionable view on global warming, and the rest is history. We lost that election after 12 years in government. I am of the view that the main reason we lost was the sentiment that it was time for a change. In the modern world, being in government for 12 years is almost an eternity; it is very hard to do. I think people wanted a change, but I do think the global warming issue did play a significant role and we were certainly seen as dragging our feet on the issue by the population.

Initially, there was a bipartisan approach between the government and the opposition on this issue, and then we reached the situation where people in the Liberal Party grew uneasy with that approach, and as a result of that Tony Abbott challenged for the leadership. He won the leadership ballot by one vote in the parliamentary party, and the issue on which he staked his challenge was opposition to agreeing with the government to have an emissions trading system. He wanted none of that. Having got the leadership, he then confronted the incumbent government. The then Prime Minister, Mr Rudd – foolishly, in my view – panicked and deferred the introduction of the emissions trading system, although he had said doing something about the climate was the greatest moral challenge of our age, which is a big call. But he decided that doing something about the greatest moral challenge of the age could be deferred for a couple of years. It rather put me in mind of the famous injunction of St Augustine: 'Lord make me pure, but not just yet.' As a result of that, his poll ratings fell. Those in his party who didn't like his style of government used that as an opportunity and, catastrophically for their own political prospects, then got rid of him as prime minister even though he had yet to complete his first political term. That is a pretty extraordinary thing for any party to do. We had a dead heat in the 2010 election and, as you know, at the last election the coalition had a very significant victory.

My point of just rehearsing that is to underline the centrality of Tony Abbot's position on global warming: how crucial a part it played in changing Australian politics and the courage that he demonstrated in bringing that about. As you know, Mr Rudd remained an aspirant for returning to his job and finally in desperation – not in affection – he was returned to the leadership two months before the last election. But by then the Australian public had decided that they really did need a change of government, and they delivered that demand very emphatically.

Australia, as you know, is a resource-rich country, as is Canada, and we are very lucky and very grateful for that. As a consequence, we have considerable respect for the place of the mining industry in Australia.

The mining industry has brought extraordinary wealth to Australia. That's not to say that everything it does is accepted uncritically, but we have a realistic appreciation of its contribution. The Australian public has now elected a government that has a pragmatic approach to the issue of global warming and a determination to treat our mining industry as a prized asset. The high level of public support for overzealous action on global warming has now passed. My suspicion is that most people in Australia, on this issue, have settled into a state of sustained agnosticism. Of course the climate is changing; it always has. There remain mixed views about how sustained that warming is and the relative contribution of mankind and natural causes. But I can assure you that in Australia the views are not mixed about things such as the soaring cost of electricity bills, with a growing consciousness that large subsidies are being paid to the production of renewable energy, and that this is having an increasingly heavy effect on low-income earners.

One of the significant aspects of this debate is that as public opinion has changed, some of the more zealous advocates have become increasingly prone to link any kind of extreme weather event with global warming. Many of you will know that just over two weeks ago we had very severe bush fires on the Lower Blue Mountains, west of Sydney. Some 200 homes were destroyed. Incidentally, can I tell you that the fires were subdued and contained in a quite brilliant fashion by both our professional and volunteer fire fighters? One of those volunteer fire fighters was our new prime minister. Tony Abbott has been a member of his local volunteer fire brigade for the last 10 years. It was no media stunt, and he actually spent some time with his fire-fighting unit participating in the efforts to contain these bushfires.

But my point about the link is that Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, immediately sought to draw a link between global warming and those bush fires on the Lower Blue Mountains, which was an extraordinary proposition. Her attempt to do so was condemned and disputed by both our minister and by the new prime minister, Tony Abbott. She said that we were all already paying a price for carbon dioxide emissions. She

tried to have a bet each way by saying that the direct link between global warming and the bushfires had not been proved yet, but she had no doubt that it would be.

But an even bigger gun was brought to bear. The former US vice-president, Al Gore, was interviewed on the ABC's flagship current affairs programme at 7.30 on a Tuesday night. He said there was no doubt about the direct link, and that Tony Abbott was wrong. He did say, of course, that he didn't want to interfere in Australian politics; he did it with a sigh.

But that is not the end of the story. With exquisite timing, which I am sure was quite accidental, the following night the same ABC commenced running an excellent three-part series on the art of Australia, narrated by the just-retired director of the New South Wales art gallery, Edmond Kapeman. One of the paintings featured in the first episode was William Strutt's iconic 'Black Thursday'. With impressive detail this depicts a huge bushfire in Victoria, which burned out a quarter of the land mass of that state, destroyed one million sheep, and claimed the lives of 12 people. According to the programme's narrator, press reports at the time said that the fire was so intense that burning embers from it landed on a ship some twenty miles out to sea. That fire, incidentally, occurred in 1851, which was 163 years ago, during a period, so we are told, when the planet was not experiencing any global warming. You might well describe all of that as an inconvenient truth.

Where, therefore, are we left in this debate? I think some straightforward conclusions can be drawn.

1. First principles tell us never to accept that all of the science is in on any proposition. Always remain open to the relevance of new research.

2. We should keep a sense of proportion, especially when it comes to the issue of inter-generational burden-sharing. I am especially indebted to Nigel Lawson's compelling point in his book *An Appeal to Reason*, that the present generation should not carry too heavy a burden so that future generations are only 8.4 times better off rather

than 9.4 times wealthier than they are today. And even if you think he or I exaggerate, even the IPCC estimates that global GDP per capita will increase 14-fold over this century, and 24-fold in the developing world.

3. Renewable energy sources should always be used when it makes economic sense to do so. No part of the proposition that I have advanced tonight and no part, as I understand it, of GWPF suggests that renewables should not be used. It is a question of their capacity to meet the need, and the economics of the use of renewables.

4. Nuclear energy must be part of the long-term response. I find the passion with which those that have an alarmist point of view on global warming oppose the nuclear industry intellectually perplexing. It is a clean energy source and, along with fossil fuels, has the capability to provide baseload power. I therefore am at a loss to understand why it should be constantly excluded on intellectual grounds. Modern nuclear power stations have a very sophisticated level of safety.

5. Always, and finally, and very importantly, bear in mind that technology will continue to surprise us. I doubt that the expression 'fracking' was widely known, let alone used, five years ago.

Can I conclude my remarks on an openly and importantly geopolitical note? As a newly retired public policymaker, but one that follows public policy debates with continued interest, getting the public policy right on this issue is the ultimate responsibility that we all have. What some people call 'the shale revolution' – now underway in the United States – has the potential to be a real game changer in the proper sense of that expression. It is still early days, but if the optimists are right, what is happening in relation to shale in the United States has the potential to significantly reduce or even end the energy dependency of the United States on Middle East sources of supply of energy.

There can be no doubt that the prospect of that will overshadow any other policy consideration in the United States. There is equally no doubt that that will be the position in the United States whether there is

a Republican or a Democrat in the White House. I know from the various interactions I have had – for four years with a Democrat administration under Clinton and seven years with a Republican administration under George W. Bush – that the juxtaposition of Middle Eastern politics and the dependency of the United States on Middle Eastern sources of energy is a hugely relevant thing for US policy making. That factor alone will dominate decision-making in the United States. In five years, that technological development alone has had an enormous impact, and has the capacity to have an even greater impact on the debate in years to come.

Can I finish by saying to Nigel Lawson and to his very energetic executive director that the Global Warming Policy Foundation is doing great work? It is arguing a case; it is exercising the right of citizens in a democracy to question presumed conventional wisdom. There is no doubt that there has been bullying in this debate. Some of the language I have found offensive. I find particularly offensive the use of the word 'denier'. We all know what that in modern parlance refers to, and it has been used in this debate with a lot of malice and not accidently. There is little doubt that the debate has changed and the atmosphere has changed; people have become more questioning. But there is also little doubt that there is still a long way to go. There are large sections of the media who have signed up to the global warming agenda as enunciated by the more alarmist point of view. That is their right; they can sign up. But it is also the right of others, and other sections of the media, to question their objectivity. That makes the contribution of a body such as this all the more important.

Vote of Thanks

Lord Lawson

Chairman of the Global Warming Policy Foundation

Thank you very much, John. I only have two things to do. The first is to thank you all for coming here this evening, and I am sure it's an evening that none of you will ever forget. It has been a great occasion.

The second thing is to thank John Howard for an outstanding lecture. He is, of course, an outstanding man. He has done us proud tonight, and I am particularly grateful to you, John, for coming a very, very long way – right from the other end of the world – to come and talk to us here this evening.

You mentioned the terrible time you had in 2007 in the election when you lost, and when your refusal to sign the Kyoto protocol was a factor there. You said that your view was not fashionable then. That's true; I happened to be in Sydney on the day of that election. I had been in New Zealand delivering a lecture, which was a trial run for the book I subsequently wrote, and on the way back I stopped off in Sydney and gave a talk to a gathering there and they very kindly gave me dinner afterwards – a very good dinner. Then after that, I went to my hotel room and turned on the television to see what was happening in the election.

What was happening was there was a fellow on the screen who was interviewing a number of voters who had just cast their vote (it was after the polls had closed), and he asked them whether they agreed that Australia should sign the Kyoto Protocol. And almost to a man and a woman, they said 'yes'. Then, very cruelly, the interviewer said to them all 'What is the Kyoto Protocol?' And, you know, none of them knew. It was quite clear that it was the politically correct thing to do, and I'm afraid that you were a victim of that. It's astonishing that Australians, of

all people, should want to be politically correct, but nevertheless they did.

Anyhow, there has been a big change in Australia, as you indicated. A great change. I have to say we could do with that change in this country. And to assist in that process, we shall be publishing your talk. I hope it will be read by every member of the Cabinet; indeed every Member of Parliament of all parties, and I hope it will make a real contribution to the change we badly need here. So, John, thank you very much indeed for coming to talk to us this evening.

The Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF) is an all-party and non-party think tank and a registered educational charity which, while open-minded on the contested science of global warming, is deeply concerned about the costs and other implications of many of the policies currently being advocated.

Our main focus is to analyse global warming policies and their economic and other implications. Our aim is to provide the most robust and reliable economic analysis and advice.

Above all we seek to inform the media, politicians and the public, in a newsworthy way, on the subject in general and on the misinformation to which they are all too frequently being subjected at the present time.

The key to the success of the GWPF is the trust and credibility that we have earned in the eyes of a growing number of policymakers, journalists and the interested public.

The GWPF is funded overwhelmingly by voluntary donations from a number of private individuals and charitable trusts. In order to make clear its complete independence, it does not accept gifts from either energy companies or anyone with a significant interest in an energy company.

Views expressed in the publications of the GWPF are those of the author(s), not those of the GWPF, its Trustees, its Academic Advisory Council members or its Directors.

Published by the Global Warming Policy Foundation, December 2013

For further information about the GWPF or a print copy of this report contact:

The Global Warming Policy Foundation
10 Upper Bank Street, London E14 5NP
T 020 7006 5827
M 07553 361717
www.thegwpf.org

Registered in England, no 6962749
Registered with the Charity Commission, no 1131448