



CLIMATE WATCH

BRIEF

AN INFORMATION UPDATE FROM THE GLOBAL CLIMATE COALITION

May 11, 1998

Volume 5, Issue 16

NEW FOCUS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE

ACTIVISTS SEEK TO BLOCK PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

During an extraordinary two-week period, global warming advocates sought to recruit both the *New York Times* and the National Academy of Sciences to block open discussion of the science of climate change — and both organizations fell victim to the activists' efforts.

The *New York Times* carried a front-page story April 26 which supposedly exposed a new program by industry to reopen the scientific debate by providing more opportunities for the public to hear from climate experts. The story was based on a summary of discussions among an informal group of think tanks and industry executives. *Times* reporter John Cushman revealed in the story that the private document had been given to him by Phil Clapp, head of the self-styled National Environmental Trust, for the specific purpose of aborting the proposed science program by giving it negative publicity "to ruin the effort to raise money."

Instead, the *Times* report appears to have revived interest in the science. Columnist Philip Burgess wrote in the *Rocky Mountain News*: "Maybe (American industry) can now sponsor a true national debate presenting both the pros and the cons of the warming scenario so that the American public can actively participate in policymaking about global warming." For too long, Burgess wrote, "the well funded global warming lobby has had a largely free ride."

Uncertainty still abounds about basic issues of climate science, and the public has a right to know, wrote the *Detroit News*. Noting that "smearing opponents to suppress facts that don't fit with its agenda has become part of the basic strategy of the environmental left," the *News* pointed to the aggressive "war room" approach of the National Environmental Trust in its efforts to manipulate public opinion on the warming issue. "The NET has unabashedly cultivated journalists, government officials, religious leaders and even children's advocacy groups" to create fears about global warming.

JOB LOSSES UNDER KYOTO AGREEMENT

Alabama	62,500
Alaska	2,600
Arizona	125,000
Arkansas	17,300
California	411,000
Colorado	40,000
Connecticut	30,600
Delaware	4,000
Florida	76,000
Georgia	45,300
Hawaii	14,600
Idaho	14,600
Illinois	240,000
Indiana	104,000
Iowa	25,300
Kansas	30,600
Kentucky	50,600
Louisiana	48,000
Maine	9,300
Maryland	46,600
Massachusetts	34,600
Michigan	125,300
Minnesota	40,000

AS TO THOSE 17,000 PESKY SCIENTISTS.....

More than 17,000 scientists have now signed the Oregon petition urging the Administration and Congress to reject the Kyoto treaty on the grounds that "there is no convincing scientific evidence" that human release of greenhouse gases will disrupt the earth's climate.

Here again, activists have worked hard to discredit the petition and its signers, using computer hackers to break into the on-line list of signatories and insert phony names, and complaining that the petition does not include details on the affiliations and credentials of the scientists. They also persuaded the *New York Times* and the National Academy of Sciences to criticize the fact that the format of the science summary circulated with the petition looked too much like an official NAS document.

The NAS says it is planning to publish a document of its own in coming weeks, to help identify gaps in the climate science. Though the NAS is now officially committed to the idea of global warming as a threat, this is a relatively new position. In 1975 -- not long ago in terms of the earth's climate -- the NAS concluded that the principal climate threat was a "significant cooling" of the planet within 100 years. But that was then.

CANADIAN DOUBTS GROW: KYOTO AGENDA "TOO AMBITIOUS"

The Canadian Government is increasingly concerned that it cannot meet the targets it agreed to at Kyoto. Paul Heinbecker, assistant deputy minister of foreign affairs, told a recent Toronto conference that the international agenda is a "bit too ambitious" and "I don't personally think it's going to work." Looking towards the November meeting in Buenos Aires, he noted ruefully that "the pace of the international agenda is getting ahead of the national agendas."

At Kyoto, Canada agreed to reduce its carbon emissions 6 percent below 1990 levels by 2010. At current economic growth rates, this would mean reducing its emissions by 25 percent. Yet environment minister Christine Stewart assured the same Toronto conference that "We will not do anything that would jeopardize our economy."

Toronto *Globe* and *Mail* columnist Terence Corcoran commented April 28: "The scale of the task facing the country is at best monumental. In practice, it is absurd. Canada has committed to reducing carbon emissions by a set percentage when in fact nobody has a clue how much carbon Canada is responsible for, nor are there any known ways to measure carbon emissions....Determining who emits carbon and how much is nothing more than a theoretical exercise." He also noted that the scientific justification for global warming is "crumbling."

JOB LOSSES

(cont'd)

Mississippi	28,000
Missouri	57,300
Montana	14,600
Nebraska	28,000
Nevada	30,600
New Hampshire	6,600
New Jersey	159,600
New Mexico	12,000
New York	145,300
North Carolina	133,000
North Dakota	2,600
Ohio	77,300
Oklahoma	26,600
Oregon	14,600
Pennsylvania	44,000
Rhode Island	2,600
South Carolina	32,000
South Dakota	6,600
Tennessee	48,000
Texas	165,300
Utah	12,000
Vermont	1,300
Virginia	84,000
Washington	60,000
West Virginia	9,300
Wisconsin	87,000
Wyoming	9,300

(Source: WEFA)



SENATE BILL AIMS TO BLOCK "BACK DOOR" POLICY

A Senate bill introduced April 30 by Sen. John Ashcroft (R-MO), seeks to block "back door" implementation of the Kyoto agreement. The "Economic Growth/Sovereignty Protection Act" would ban the spending of federal funds for "rules, regulations or programs" designed to implement the agreement.

The bill specifically targets the Environmental Protection Agency, which has been pressuring state and local governments to reduce emissions and has claimed in an internal memorandum that it may already have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide under the Clean Air Act.

The bill states that "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not have the authority to promulgate regulations to limit the emissions of carbon dioxide."

Implementing a treaty without the Senate's approval "is contrary to the Constitution and the checks and balances established by the framers," said Ashcroft. "The American president is not a monarch who is able to make treaties without oversight by the people's elected representatives. In our nation, a president is not empowered to make treaties that unilaterally bind American sovereignty."

"This legislation will protect the American economy, our jobs and incomes, and it will uphold important constitutional values. Having given away far too much to get a bad agreement in Kyoto, the Administration is seeking to put salt into this wound by sneaking the Kyoto terms past the Senate and public."

OFFICIAL U.S. STUDY INDICATES KYOTO WILL PRODUCE MINIMAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

The Administration has acknowledged for the first time that the Kyoto agreement will have only a modest effect on reducing emissions -- due to the fast increasing emissions of developing nations who are not party to the agreement.

A study released April 22 by the Energy Information Administration found that carbon dioxide emissions will increase 32 percent by 2010 despite the Kyoto-mandated cuts in emissions for industrialized nations. By 2020, emissions are forecast to increase by nearly 60 percent even when factoring in complete compliance with the Kyoto agreement by the developed world.

In an interview with *The Washington Times*, Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE), who headed the Senate delegation to Kyoto, said that the agreement is "even deadlier than it was before in the Senate, if that's possible."

CLIMATE WATCH

BRIEF

Discussing the study's forecast for 2010, he said that "for a 10 percent swing in emissions, the reward is not worth the effort. Why would you do the kind of damage to your economy and competitiveness and national sovereignty, if in fact you're not going to get any results? The fact is, without developing countries, of course you're going to have an increase in greenhouse gases. That's why this Kyoto protocol is complete folly, complete nonsense."

Developing countries which are not required to reduce emissions under the Kyoto agreement are forecast to account for 75 percent of the increase in emissions between 1990 and 2020, according to the study.

.....BUT COULD "DEVASTATE" CALIFORNIAN ECONOMY

A study to be released next month projects a "devastating economic impact" on Californian businesses and families if the Kyoto agreement is implemented. "California would be particularly hard hit because of its heavy reliance on oil, natural gas, and electricity, all targets in the Clinton-Gore Administrations push for sharp reductions in greenhouse gas emissions," said economist Glenn Schleede, the study's author.

Sponsored by the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy and the National Consumer Coalition, the study found that expected new gasoline taxes would increase a family's driving costs by an average of over 40 percent to \$715 dollars per household and could go higher. Electricity prices, already well above the national average, would also increase substantially -- an average increased cost to families in the range of \$237 to \$946 per household. Senior citizens would be particularly hard hit as a larger share of their fixed incomes would go to higher energy costs.

The full economic impact of the Kyoto agreement would be further magnified by increased competitive pressure on Californian businesses from China, India and Mexico. "Individuals and families in California deserve to have objective information on the real implications of the Administration's plans for reducing greenhouse gas emissions," said Schleede. "Unfortunately, the Administration has not made this information available, despite the fact it is precisely individuals and families who will bear all the costs and feel the impact of reduced energy supplies."

EUROPEANS, JAPAN SIGN CLIMATE CHANGE PACT

The 15 European Union member countries signed the Kyoto agreement April 29 and sought to put further pressure on the United States. "I hope to see the United States signing as early as possible," said EU environmental chief Ritt Bjerregaard.

Britain's deputy prime minister, John Prescott, said the Europeans were confident that Clinton would sign the treaty but they understood that it may not be sent to Congress for ratification for some time.

Japan signed the treaty April 28, becoming the first major industrial nation to do so.