

Laser Talks #CCCLConf2014

SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO PRACTICE LASER TALKS:

PAIR AND SHARE: practice the laser talks with a partner over coffee.

MIRROR WORK: Rehearse them in front of a mirror

PICK AND CHOOSE: Practice the laser talks that interest you the most – you don't have to learn all of them. If you are new to Citizens Climate Lobby – keep it simple. The first six laser talks are the most important, as well as the laser talk directed at the various political parties.

Caveat: the laser talks are not meant for people to present a monologue on the various aspects of carbon pricing and climate change. The real purpose of the laser talks is to facilitate a discussion on climate change with representatives, the media and the general public. Note the laser talks directed at MPs from the various political parties are talking points to work with to help you appreciate your MP! You can find other talking points that help you appreciate your MP too.

Citizens' Climate Lobby

Citizens' Climate Lobby is an international, non-partisan organization that empowers citizens to lobby their representatives for a revenue neutral price on carbon pollution. Currently we have over 200 chapters in North America. It was founded in the USA in 2007 by [Marshall Saunders](#) and is modeled after the international poverty reduction organization called [RESULTS](#). RESULTS is also our sister organization.

Since September 2010, Canadian Citizens Climate Lobbyists have, through teleconference calls, monthly actions, and conferences, educated ourselves about the various aspects of climate change from the economics and science to the sociology, communication and its myriad connections to almost everything.

After three years of building a small and effective army of concerned citizens in Canada from over 40 ridings, we descended on Parliament Hill, Monday, November 18, 2013, to lobby our MPs for a price on carbon pollution. We lobbied 26 MPs, one senator and the aides of Justin Trudeau and Elizabeth May for carbon fee and dividend.

In June 2014, 26 Canadians joined approximately 600 of our US colleagues and lobbied the offices almost 500 members of the US Congress in Washington DC for a carbon tax. We also lobbied the [World Bank](#), and the [Canadian Embassy](#) in Washington. This was Canadian CCL's fourth year lobbying in Washington, DC. We are returning to Ottawa on [November 22-24, 2014](#) to advance our understanding of climate change and how to combat it at our national conference and then lobby our MPs and senators for carbon fee and dividend.

Carbon Fee and Dividend

Carbon fee and dividend is a revenue-neutral price on carbon that functions as follows:

- A fee is placed on carbon-based fuels at the source (well, mine or port of entry)
- This fee increases steadily each year so that clean energy is cheaper than fossil fuels within a decade
- All of the money collected is returned to Canadians on an equitable basis.
- Under this plan [66% percent of Canadian households](#) would break even or receive more in their dividend check than they would pay for the increased cost of energy, thereby protecting the poor and middle class.
- A predictably increasing carbon price will send a clear market signal which will unleash entrepreneurs and investors in the new clean-energy economy.

The Five Chief Ways to Price Carbon

There are five ways to price carbon. They are listed here from least transparent to most transparent:

- i) **The Status Quo:** external costs of climate change are not internalized and the taxpayer is forced to pay for climate and health-related damages.
- ii) **Regulation:** sector by sector regulation of all the sectors in the economy that produce carbon pollution.
- iii) **Cap and Trade:** put a mandatory limit (or "cap") on some portion of national emissions, and allow firms to buy and sell rights to emit within the cap as well. This can be with or without offsets. A **carbon offset** is a reduction in emissions of carbon dioxide or greenhouse gases made in order to compensate for an emission made elsewhere.
- iv) **Carbon Tax:** a tax based on greenhouse gas emissions generated from burning fuels. The tax may or may not be revenue neutral. A revenue neutral tax is one that does not have a net increase in overall federal tax revenues.
- v) **Carbon Fee and Dividend:** An incrementally increasing fee is placed on carbon pollution and 100% of the money is returned to households. The term fee is used deliberately to indicate clearly that it is a revenue neutral pricing system. Carbon fee and dividend, as proposed by Citizens Climate Lobby, is an upstream fee and is levied at point of production of fossil fuels (at the well head, mine or point of entry). A downstream tax, on the other hand, would be levied at the point of consumption of fossil fuels and/or products dependent on fossil fuels.

Why we want 100% revenue neutrality

1. A 100 percent rebate ensures that [two-thirds of Canadian](#) households will come out equal or ahead regarding the increase in energy costs. This calculation takes into account not just direct energy costs, but the pass-through businesses will add to the cost of their products.
2. Members of Parliament who feel pressured to not increase taxes can still vote the right way.
3. If while steadily raising the price of carbon-based fuels we eliminate all energy subsidies, we allow the market to go to work without the government picking winners and losers. Venture capitalists, banks, and entrepreneurs seeing a predictable price signal will create breakthroughs in innovation that in some cases are unimaginable at this point. A carbon fee is the most efficient and direct way to send a meaningful price signal to the markets, better than subsidies but also better than alternatives such as government regulations or cap and trade.
4. Asking citizens to voluntarily curtail their use of fossil fuels when others may not choose to do so can be demoralizing and ineffective. To maintain public support of the price we will ultimately need to stabilize CO2 emissions, citizens will need to receive a significant dividend.

Carbon fee and dividend will protect people living on lower and middle incomes

The Centre for Policy Alternatives, using income tax data from British Columbia, has determined that two thirds of Canadians emit average or less than average greenhouse gas emissions.

This is important because with carbon fee and dividend, every household receives the same amount of money in their dividend cheque, regardless of their emissions or income.

Thus, as you can see in the table below, middle and lower income Canadians would receive more in their dividend cheque than what they paid in carbon fees. Thus, with carbon fee and dividend, two thirds of households will come out even or ahead, especially those with lower incomes.

Another interesting statistic from the 2011 Centre for Policy Alternatives research was that the top 1% of households emitted three times more greenhouse gases than average and almost 6 times more than households in the bottom 10%.

In conclusion, carbon fee and dividend is a progressive carbon levy that will reward carbon-conscious consumers and protect people living on lower incomes as we transition away from a high-carbon economy.

Table 1: Net profit or loss from carbon fee and rebates by income quintile (in %).

Population Distribution	Average	1 st Quintile	2 nd Quintile	3 rd Quintile	4 th Quintile	5 th Quintile
Income Range (\$CDN)		Up to 40 000	40-60 000	60-85 000	85-125 000	Over 125 000
CO2 Eq.	13	8.6	11.1	12.6	13.5	15.5
Dividend Received/Fees Paid (%)	100%	151%	118%	103%	96%	84%

References

Lee, Marc, and Amanda Card. *Who Occupies the Sky?: The Distribution of GHGs in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2011. Web. 30 Oct 2014.

<https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2011/11/Who%20Occupies%20the%20Sky.pdf>

Ivanova, Iglia. "What Is a Middle Class Income These Days?" *Policy Note*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 20 July 2011. Web. 30 Oct. 2014. <http://www.policynote.ca/what-is-a-middle-class-income-these-days/>.

REMI study and BC carbon tax data support revenue neutral carbon tax

MP _____, thank you for running for office. What you're doing is very difficult, but we need people like you doing this in order to have a healthy democracy.

Have you heard about a policy called 'carbon fee and dividend'? Though the conventional thinking has long been that addressing climate change requires the economy to suffer, Citizens' Climate Lobby commissioned a study that showed quite the opposite.

CCL hired Regional Economic Models, Inc. (REMI) to do the study. This group has done studies for the American Gas Association, the Nuclear Energy Institute, the National Federation of Independent Business, and Price Waterhouse Cooper.

This highly-respected economic modeling firm ran a 20-year analysis that examined a steadily-rising fee on carbon pollution that returns 100% of revenues back to households as a monthly dividend. The REMI study found such a fee would add 2.8 million jobs to the economy, \$1.38 trillion to GDP, and save 227,000 American lives while cutting CO2 emissions to 50% of 1990 levels.

The big winners were labour-intensive industries like retail, services, and healthcare, because people had more money in their pockets. For the same reason, construction, auto manufacturing, and real estate also do better with the policy than without. While this study is from the United States, it is no doubt of great interest to Canadians as well.

British Columbia already has a carbon tax that recycles the revenue back to citizens. A recently released five year study on BC's carbon tax found BC's per capita fossil fuel use has decreased while BC's GDP growth slightly outpaced the rest of the country.

The message is clear: a revenue neutral carbon tax can stimulate the economy while reducing carbon emissions. Is this a policy you might consider supporting?

References

Nystrom, Scott, and Patrick Luckow. *The Economic, Climate, Fiscal, Power, and Demographic Impact of a National Fee-and-Dividend Carbon Tax*. Washington, DC: Regional Economic Models, Inc. and Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., 2014. Web. 30 Oct 2014. <http://citizensclimatelobby.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/REMI-carbon-tax-report-62141.pdf>

Beaty, Ross, Richard Lipsey, and Stewart Elgie. "The Shocking Truth about B.C.'s Carbon Tax: It Works." *The Globe and Mail* 9 July 2014. Phillip Crawley. Web. 30 Oct. 2014. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/the-insidious-truth-about-bcs-carbon-tax-it-works/article19512237/>.

Border Tax Adjustments

In order for a fee on carbon to work on a domestic and on an international scale, an effective border tax adjustment will be necessary. Applied to imports from countries that don't have equivalent carbon pricing, the purpose of the border tax adjustment would be to protect Canadian businesses from unfair foreign competition.

In international legal circles, Joost Pauwelyn is considered the world's top World Trade Organization (WTO) expert. From Geneva, Mr. Pauwelyn assured us that a border tax adjustment is viable. He assigned a group of graduate students the task of researching how international carbon pricing mechanisms could be harmonized with a domestic fee on carbon while complying with WTO law. While it will probably be more complicated than we would like, top legal scholars say that a border tax adjustment will pass WTO scrutiny.

Having a border tax adjustment will ensure that if countries like India and China want to keep using dirty manufacturing processes, they'll have to pay the Canadian government for the privilege.

On January 1, 1994, the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect. Under NAFTA, Canada, USA and Mexico have an obligation to protect the environment.

NAFTA and Carbon Fee and Dividend

The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation was negotiated and implemented in parallel to NAFTA. It requires that each Party ensures its laws provide for high levels of environmental protection without lowering standards to attract investment. Each Party agreed to effectively enforce its environmental laws through the use of inspectors, monitoring compliance and pursuing the necessary legal means to seek appropriate remedies for violations. Each Party must also provide a report on the state of its environment, develop environmental emergency preparedness measures, promote environmental education, research and development, assess environmental impacts and promote the use of economic instruments.

As well, under NAFTA Article 604: Export Taxes, parties are allowed to maintain duties, taxes or other charge on the export of any energy or basic petrochemical good to the territory of another Party if the duty, tax or other charge applies to the exports of any such good to the territory of all other Parties and any such good when destined for domestic consumption.

Thus, we are confident that Carbon Fee and Dividend would be acceptable under NAFTA rules.

References

- Briefing. "NAFTA at 20: Ready to Take off Again?" *The Economist* 4 Jan. 2014. The Economist Group. Web. 30 Oct. 2014. <<http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21592631-two-decades-ago-north-american-free-trade-agreement-got-flying-start-then-it>>.
- "NAFTA - Chapter 6." *Foreign Trade Information System*. 17 Dec. 1992. Web. 30 Oct. 2014. <<http://www.sice.oas.org/trade/nafta/chap-06.asp>>.

The Effect of Pricing Carbon on Farmers

Agriculture in Canada is heavily dependent on fossil fuels for running machinery and producing fertilizers, and a price on carbon would, by design, increase the price of fossil fuels.

For farmers, however, the impact associated with a price on carbon is not nearly as great – or as volatile – as other factors, especially if the fee starts low and increases predictably over time. For example, in Canada the price of farm machinery fuel increased by 25% in 2011 from 2010. As well, during that same time period fertilizer prices rose 29%.⁽¹⁾ Commodity prices, which determine the income farmers receive at any given time, are also extremely volatile.⁽²⁾

In addition, the impact of a price on carbon will be miniscule compared to the impact climate change will have on future farm productivity over the long-term if CO₂ emissions are left unmitigated. A March 2013 report by Canada 2020 concluded that *"climate uncertainty and climate extremes are givens for the future of Canadian agriculture and while there may be some initial benefits from rising temperatures and elevated carbon dioxide levels such benefits are unlikely to last. There is a growing body of evidence pointing to temperature and CO₂ thresholds, beyond which yields will level off or decline. These risks need to be addressed and policies put in place to reduce them."*⁽³⁾

Also, bear in mind that a price on carbon will be an economic opportunity for many farmers and ranchers as demand for carbon-free energy increases. Wind developers are leasing land from farmers to erect turbines. Solar farms can also replace cropland that doesn't generate enough income from traditional farming.

Of note, British Columbia's carbon tax does not appear to have had a measurable impact on international agricultural trade, despite concerns it would greatly reduce the BC industry's competitiveness, according to new analysis commissioned by the Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions (PICS).⁽⁴⁾

Bottom line: The additional cost of a price on carbon is negligible compared to the increased volatility that comes with a changing climate. In fact, a gradually and predictably increasing price on carbon creates an opportunity for farmers to balance that volatility with steady cash flow from renewables that share land with their crops.

References

(1) Canadian Farm Fuel and Fertilizers: Prices and Expenses (Agriculture Canada)

http://www.agr.gc.ca/pol/mad-dam/index_e.php?s1=pubs&s2=rmar&s3=php&page=rmar_04_01_2012-03-00

(2) Overview of Agriculture and the Agri-food system (Agriculture Canada)

<http://www.agr.gc.ca/eng/industry-markets-and-trade/statistics-and-market-information/by-product-sector/crops/crops-market-information-canadian-industry/market-outlook-report/canadian-farm-fuel-and-fertilizerprices-and-expenses-march-2012/?id=1378845446435>

(3) Canada 2020 - Analytical Commentary on Agriculture and Climate Change (Canada 2020)

<http://canada2020.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Canada-2020-Analytical-Commentary-No.-2-Agriculture-and-Climate-Change-14-March-2013.pdf>

(4) The effect of British Columbia's Carbon Tax on Agricultural Trade.

<http://pics.uvic.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Carbon%20Tax%20on%20Agricultural%20Trade.pdf>

Natural Gas as a 'Transition' Fuel?

Cornell University professor Robert Howarth, concluded in his May 15, 2014 paper in Energy Science and Engineering: *“Using these new, best available data and a 20-year time period for comparing the warming potential of methane to carbon dioxide, the conclusion stands that both shale gas and conventional natural gas have a larger GHG than do coal or oil, for any possible use of natural gas.”*[1]

Burning natural gas produces less CO₂ than coal or oil for the same amount of energy produced.[2] However, if only 3.2% of natural gas escapes into the atmosphere anywhere from the ground where it is extracted to the power plant, stove, or home where it is burned, then natural gas is just as bad for the climate as coal.[3] Previous studies suggest that more than 3.2% leaks, partly due to the fact that long distance pipeline infrastructure used to transport is an average of 50 years old.[4] However, if the leakage problem can be solved natural gas could serve as a transition fuel while we convert to renewable energy.

Society needs to wean itself from the addiction to fossil fuels as quickly as possible. But to replace some fossil fuels (coal, oil) with another (natural gas) will not suffice as an approach to take on global warming. Rather, we should embrace the technologies of the 21st Century, and convert our energy systems to ones that rely on wind, solar, and water power

Germany has shifted from getting 6% of its electricity from renewables in 2000 to 25% today.[5] On one day in April, 16, 2014 7 GWh of its electricity came from solar, equivalent to 8 Japanese nuclear reactors running full tilt for 24 hours.[6] Interestingly, Germany shares a few degrees of latitude with Alaska, and is further north than any other US state except the northernmost tip of Maine.[6] Portugal also increased the percentage of its electricity sourced from renewables from 17% in 2005 [7] to 70% in the first quarter of 2013.[8]

(1) A bridge to nowhere: methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas. Energy Science and Engineering, May 15, 2014. Robert W. Howarth <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/enhanced/doi/10.1002/ese3.35>

(2) US Energy Information Administration. “Frequently Asked Questions”. US EIA. Last updated: March 4, 2013. Last accessed: 5-16-13. URL: <http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=73&t=11>

(3) Ramón A. Alvarez, Stephen W. Pacala, James J. Winebrake, William L. Chameides, and Steven P. Hamburg. “Greater focus needed on methane leakage from natural gas infrastructure”. 2012. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 109 (17). pps 6435-6440.

(4) Robert W. Howarth & Renee Santoro & Anthony Ingraffea. “Venting and leaking of methane from shale gas development: response to Cathles et al.”. 2012. Climatic Change. DOI 10.1007/s10584-012-0401-0. URL for pdf download:<https://www.google.com/urlq=http://my-pages.net/alerteschiste/fichiers/H...>

(5) Tara Lohan. “While Germany Is Headed for 80% Renewable Energy, We’re Getting Left in the Dust”. Nov. 21, 2012. AlterNet.org. Last accessed: 5-19-13. URL: <http://www.alternet.org/environment/while-germany-headed-80-renewable-energy-were-getting-left-dust>

(6) Thomas. “Solar Power Record In Germany — 22.68 GW — Infographic”. April 16, 2013. Clean Technica. Last accessed: 5-19-13. URL: <http://cleantechnica.com/2013/04/16/solar-power-record-in-germany-22-68-gw-infographic/>

(7) Google Earth.

(8) Elisabeth Rosenthal. “Portugal gives itself a clean-energy makeover.” August 9, 2010. The New York Times. Last accessed: 5-19-13. URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/10/science/earth/10portugal.html?_r=0

(8) Ryan Koronowski. “Is 70 Percent Renewable Power Possible? Portugal Just Did It For 3 Months”. April 14, 2013. Think Progress. Last accessed: 5-19-13. URL: <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/04/14/1858811/is-70-renewable-power-possible-portugal-just-did-it-for-3-months/?mobile=nc>

We Can Switch to Renewables in 20 Years

In 2009, Mark Jacobson (Stanford University) and Mark Delucchi (University of California, Davis) wrote a plan for how to provide electricity for the entire world by 2030 using only wind, water, and solar technology already available at that time.

When they created this plan to meet the world's energy demand in 20 years, they took into account that the world adds approximately 1 billion people every 12 years and that emerging economies are looking to have our lifestyle, which requires greater energy needs.

Their report shows we can meet the entire world's energy needs with renewables in 20 years, that we can do it without nuclear, and that we can do it for the same money that we'd be spending on fossil fuel power.

Jacobson, Mark Z. and Mark A. Delucchi. "A Plan to Power 100 Percent of the Planet with Renewables: Wind, water and solar technologies can provide 100 percent of the world's energy, eliminating all fossil fuels. Here's how." *Scientific American*, November 2009. <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=a-path-to-sustainable-e...>

Cutting carbon is cheaper than we realize

The conventional wisdom has always been that taking the necessary steps to reduce the threat of climate change will play havoc with the economy.

In other words, we can cut carbon and stabilize our climate, or we can grow the global economy and thereby lift more people out of poverty and continue to enjoy our comfortable lifestyles. But we cannot do both at the same time.

That myth is now exploded.

According to a report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, drastic action must be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but the cost of that action is much smaller than anyone thinks.

While economic growth is between 1.6 percent and 3 percent a year, the report states that mitigation would slow that rate of growth only 0.06 percent a year.

The report does not factor in the positive impacts of mitigation, such as improved health from the reduction of air pollution. Nor does it factor in minimizing economic losses from the damage climate change causes. If these factors are taken into account, the cost of mitigating climate change is far cheaper than doing nothing.

The latest IPCC report shows that economic impact can no longer be used as an excuse to delay action that will cut greenhouse gases.

http://report.mitigation2014.org/spm/ipcc_wg3_ar5_summary-for-policymakers_approved.pdf

Canada's most pressing health issue is climate change

There is growing concern among Canadian public health officials about the effect of climate change on the health of Canadians. The consequences of climate change include decreased air quality, more severe weather events, and the spread of vector-borne disease, all of which are seriously detrimental to human health.

Burning fossil fuels is an obvious cause of decreased air quality, but climate change reduces air quality directly as well. Scientists predict that warmer temperatures caused by climate change will increase the amount of ground-level ozone, a harmful pollutant and an element of smog. In 2008, the Canadian Medical Association (CMA) projected that the cumulative cost of air pollution from 2008 to 2031 would be \$250 billion. They also estimated that in that period of time ninety thousand people would die from the acute effects of air pollution, with an addition seven hundred thousand dying of long-term exposure to pollution. Air pollution is a serious concern that is aggravated further by climate change.

The increase in severe weather events that is a symptom of climate change also has obvious and severe consequences for human health. Extreme weather events like heat waves and floods cause injury, disease, and death. Canada is projected to experience a higher rate of warming in this century than most of the globe, with all the accompanying risks.

The changing climate may also facilitate the spread of certain diseases. For instance, diseases transmitted by animals are limited by the animal's geographic range. Lyme Disease, carried by ticks, is likely to be seen further and further north as temperatures rise.

Recently the Globe and Mail spoke to several prominent public health officers about the linkages between climate change and health. Dr. Eilish Cleary, Chief Medical Officer of Health for New Brunswick, expressed the necessity of considering human health when making decisions about emissions. She said, *"There hasn't been adequate recognition by all levels of policy-makers and decision-makers that it is really a problem that we have to do something about."* Nova Scotia's Chief Public Health Officer Dr. Robert Strang concurred, adding that the discourse has been too focused on adaptation to the exclusion of mitigation planning.

In May 2009, a joint report by University College London (UCL) and the Lancet declared climate change to be the "biggest global-health threat of the 21st century." On June 25th of 2014, the British Medical Association passed a motion inspired by the Lancet Commission to "transfer their investments from energy companies whose primary business relies upon fossil fuels to those providing renewable energy sources." The BMA is the first health organization in the world to divest.

Public health officials know: if you are concerned about public health you should also be concerned about climate change. If we want to prevent the health consequences of climate change, we need to work to decrease our fossil fuel emissions. That's why Citizens' Climate Lobby supports a revenue-neutral carbon tax as proposed by MP Bruce Hyer in the House of Commons. The return of 100% of the proceeds from the tax is the spoonful of sugar that helps the medicine of divestment go down smoothly. It's time to take action.

¹ <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/health.html>

² http://www.cma.ca/multimedia/CMA/Content/Images/Inside_cma/Office_Public_Health/ICAP/CMA_ICAP_sum_e.pdf

³ <http://policybase.cma.ca/dbtw-wpd/Policypdf/PD10-07.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/health.html>

⁵ <http://bma.org.uk/working-for-change/arm-2014-info/agenda/finances-of-the-association>

⁶ <http://treealerts.org/region/europe/2014/06/british-medical-association-votes-to-divest-from-fossil-fuels/>

For MPs in the Liberal Party of Canada – April 2014

Citizen Climate Lobbyists (CCL) have read the Liberal Party's top 2014 Policy Resolutions with great interest, and thank the Liberal Party for welcoming consultations from citizens and groups such as CCL (1).

CCL thanks the Liberal Party for recognizing the need to eliminate subsidies to fossil fuel companies, which clearly do not need handouts that cost every Canadian about \$800 annually, according to a 2013 IMF report (2,3). We are also very encouraged to see the Liberal Party articulate the need for a compelling (4) National Energy Strategy that will transition our energy system to one that is low-carbon. As stated in the policy resolution, such a transition must be designed to increase overall employment, utilize market mechanisms to reduce pollution and enhance competition for innovation in low-carbon technologies, and eliminate subsidies hindering the low-carbon transition, to name a few.

We believe that you will be very interested in Analytica Advisor's 2014 Canadian Clean Technology Industry Report (5).

The clean tech industry has the potential to completely transform Canadian industrial practices while increasing employment from 41,000 Canadians currently to 100,000 in just eight years. Given the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gases in Canada and around the world – the more these clean-tech jobs created the better.

The Conservatives are missing out on an opportunity to use a market-based mechanism to tackle our greenhouse house gas emissions while at the same time strengthen Canada's economy. Liberals can differentiate themselves with a focus on jobs and economic diversification that will move Canada more quickly to a low carbon future (6).

Today, clean technology is an \$11 billion industry made up of 700 small to medium sized enterprises, which invests \$1 billion a year in research and development with minimal support from the federal government. It has the potential to grow into a \$50 billion industry by 2022 with the right policies, investment and industry engagement.

The Liberal Party is right to identify market mechanisms as an effective means to grow this industry. Many economists advise that a rising fee on carbon at the wellhead with revenue given to Canadian households will send a market signal to industry to improve efficiencies and competitiveness, while helping Canadians shoulder rising costs associated with the rising carbon fee. BC's clean technology sector grew by 48 percent in just two years after the province legislated its carbon tax (6).

If a private members bill for carbon fee and dividend was introduced in the House of Commons would you consider supporting it?

References:

(1) <https://convention.liberal.ca/2014-policy-resolutions/>

(2) <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2013/012813.pdf>

(3) <http://ecoopportunity.net/2013/04/fossil-fuel-subsidies-nearly-800-per-canadian-says-the-imf/> (4)

<http://www.sciencerecorder.com/news/emerging-economies-enforce-climate-laws/>

(5)

http://citizensclimatelobby.ca/sites/default/files/files/ANALYTICA2014%20Canadian%20Clean%20Technology%20Industry%20Report_Exec%20Summary.pdf

(6) <http://www.vancouversun.com/life/environment/Opinion+personal+awakening+clean+energy/9017899/story.html>

For MPs in the New Democratic Party of Canada – April 2014

Citizens' Climate Lobby thanks New Democrats for recognizing the need to eliminate \$1 billion dollars annually in subsidies to fossil fuel companies. These companies clearly do not need handouts that cost every Canadian about \$1000 annually, according to a 2013 IMF report (1).

CCL is also encouraged to hear New Democrats articulate their support for Canada's clean tech industry, which has the potential to completely transform and "green" Canadian industrial practices while increasing employment from the 41,000 Canadians currently to 100,000 in just eight years. We believe that you will be very interested in Analytica Advisor's 2014 Canadian Clean Technology Industry Report (2). This report highlights Canada's clean technology which today is an \$11 billion industry made up of 700 small to medium sized enterprises and which invests \$1 billion a year in research and development with minimal support from the federal government. With the right government policies, investment and industry engagement it has the potential to grow into a \$50 billion industry by 2022.

Citizens' Climate Lobby and New Democrats agree on the urgent need to act on climate change. New Democrats recognize the need to price carbon, and believe – like CCL - that a market-based solution is better than regulation. We understand that your preferred carbon pricing mechanism is cap and trade, which is CCL's "second favourite" carbon pricing mechanism*. You may be interested in a new Stanford study that found that the burden of carbon regulation is heaviest on the poor but that the effect of pricing carbon on lower income groups can be addressed through transfer payments, such as a dividend or lowering taxes such as payroll or income (3).

Many economists advise that a rising fee on carbon at the wellhead with revenue given to Canadian households will send a market signal to industry to improve efficiencies and competitiveness, while helping Canadians shoulder rising costs associated with the rising carbon fee. BC's clean technology sector grew by 48 percent in just two years after the province introduced its carbon tax (4).

It is interesting to note that Australia introduced a carbon pricing mechanism in 2012 that blended both a carbon tax and a cap and trade system. It starts with a fixed price on carbon for three years, then transitions from 2015 to 2018 to a cap-and-trade program, with a price cap and price floor (5).

Until the New Democrats have the opportunity to introduce their own climate legislation, given the scientific consensus on the urgent need to act on climate change and curb carbon emissions, and the need for our Parliament need to be more responsive to the crisis, if there was a Private Members Bill for Carbon fee and dividend, would you consider supporting it in the House of Commons?

* We are not opposed to any mechanisms that reduce GHGs and prefer market-based mechanisms over regulation.

References:

(1) <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2013/012813.pdf>

(2) http://citizensclimatelobby.ca/sites/default/files/files/ANALYTICA2014%20Canadian%20Clean%20Technology%20Industry%20Report_Exec%20Summary.pdf

(3) <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2014/february/kolstad-carbon-tax-022814.html>

(4) <http://www.kpmg.com/Ca/en/IssuesAndInsights/ArticlesPublications/Documents/Cleantech%20Report%20Card%20for%20BC.pdf>

(5) http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/Australia_Pricing_Mechanism.pdf

Revised Laser Talk Talking to Conservatives (from April 2014)

Citizens' Climate Lobby appreciates the current federal government's commitment to a strong stable economy that is supported by a healthy environment, to provide Canadians with a high and enduring quality of life. In particular, CCL appreciates the Conservative government's joining the Climate & Clean Air Coalition to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants, which is using an international treaty to reduce black carbon .

We recognize under your government's watch Canada's carbon emissions have fallen (1).

Citizens' Climate Lobby also recognizes individual steps this government has taken towards a healthier environment, including past initiatives like the EcoEnergy Retrofit program, and other ongoing programs such as:

- Regulating Greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector (2)
- Investment in the green energy sector through Sustainable Development Technology Canada (3)
- Establishment of the Pulp and Paper Green Transformation Program (4)
- Investment in the Green Infrastructure Fund (5)
- Creating the Clean Energy Fund to support projects such as carbon capture & storage (6)
- Expanding eligibility for the accelerated capital cost allowance for clean energy generation equipment (7)
- Establishing a \$1.5 Billion trust fund to help provinces & territories invest in clean air projects (8)

The federal government's commitment to a strong economy that is harmonized to that of the United States is well recognized, and CCL acknowledges the work that is being done with the U.S. on the Clean Energy Dialogue to collaborate on clean energy R & D and deployment, and building a more efficient electricity grid.

We believe that you will be very interested in Analytica Advisor's 2014 Canadian Clean Technology Industry Report (9). Today, clean technology is an \$11 billion industry made up of 700 small to medium sized enterprises, which invests \$1 billion a year in research and development with minimal government support. It has the potential to grow into a \$50 billion industry by 2022 with the right policies, investment and industry engagement.

Currently the destabilizing climate effects of global warming emissions, particularly carbon dioxide, are placing our strong economy in jeopardy, along with Canada's pristine environment and the health and safety of Canadians. Strong statements from the IMF, the OECD, the World Bank, and the IEA regarding the urgent need for governments around the world, including Canada, to do more to radically reduce carbon emissions bolster the case for urgent and effective action (10).

The good news is that there is a growing consensus among economists, including conservative ones, that the solution to the challenges of global warming, and an alternative to costly and risky government intervention in the market place through sector by sector regulation, is a consumer-friendly price on carbon. They agree that it should be enacted in the following way:

- **Start small and increase predictably.** Businesses need predictable energy prices and the economy needs a smooth transition.
- **Revenue Neutral.** All the revenue is returned to citizens to mitigate the economic impact.

- **Easy to administer at home and to emulate abroad.** The fee is collected only once, as far upstream as practical.
- **Protects business** from unfair domestic & international competition using border taxes and credits.
- **Doesn't play favourites.** Lets markets and localities pick the winning technologies.
- **Doesn't grow government.** A straightforward carbon fee takes no time to set up and requires no additional bureaucracy. It's easy to understand and to monitor.

Citizens Climate Lobby invites the Conservative government to support carbon fee and dividend legislation, for the good of our country and to preserve a livable world for future generations.

Resources:

- (1) Canada's [National Inventory Report](#) Part 1, PDF page 19, Figures S-4 and S-5
- (2) <http://www.climatechange.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=4FE85A4C-1>
- (3) http://www.sdtdc.ca/index.php?page=about-our-funds&hl=en_CA
- (4) <http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/forests/federal-programs/13141>
- (5) <http://www.infrastructure.gc.ca/prog/gif-fiv-eng.html>
- (6) <http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/energy/funding/current-funding-programs/cef/4949>
- (7) <http://actionplan.gc.ca/en/initiative/tax-support-clean-energy-generation>
- (8) <http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/ecoaction/>
- (9) http://citizensclimatelobby.ca/sites/default/files/files/ANALYTICA2014%20Canadian%20Clean%20Technology%20Industry%20Report_Exec%20Summary.pdf
- (10) Link to compilation of quotes

Compilation of quotes

International Energy Agency (IEA): “If current trends continue, and we go on building high-carbon energy generation, then by 2017, there will be no room for manoeuvre at all – the whole of the carbon budget will be spoken for.” <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change?newsfeed=true>

World Bank: Produced a report in November 2012 entitled: **Turn Down the Heat: Why A 4 Degree Warmer World ... Must Be Avoided ..** “We’re on track for a 4°C warmer world marked by extreme heat-waves, declining global food stocks, loss of ecosystems and biodiversity, and life-threatening sea level rise.” World Bank, “Turn Down The Heat”

“If there is no action soon [on greenhouse gas reductions], the future will become bleak.” Jim Yong Ki, President, World Bank http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/make-climate-change-a-priority/2013/01/24/6c5c2b66-65b1-11e2-9e1b-07db1d2ccd5b_story.html.

International Monetary Fund: “Stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases will require a radical transformation of the global energy system over coming decades.” - (factsheet: Climate, Environment, and the IMF Published March 18, 2014) “Even more important is the issue of climate change, which, in my view, is by far the greatest economic challenge of the 21st century. The science is sobering — the global temperature in 2012 was among the hottest since records began in 1880. Make no mistake: without concerted action, the very future of our planet is in peril.” - IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde, January 2013

World Economic Forum: “Greening economic growth is the only way in which sustainable, inclusive development can be achieved that will satisfy the basic needs of 9 billion people and provide them with equal rights to material prosperity. **A key challenge is the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions to avoid the catastrophic impacts of global warming.**” - Climate Change and Green Growth, WEF <http://www.weforum.org/issues/climate-change-and-green-growth>

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): “Any new fossil resources brought to market - conventional or unconventional - risk taking us further away from the trajectory we need to be on.” OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurría http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/09/fossil-fuel-emissions-oecd_n_4069672.html

“Unlike the financial crisis, we do not have a 'climate bailout option' up our sleeves...And despite all the attention given to climate change deniers, our understanding of the scale of the risk is much better developed than our understanding of the financial risks, pre-crisis.” OECD Sec-General Gurría <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-2445043>

What's Happening Worldwide with Carbon Taxes and other Greenhouse Gas Initiatives?

We are often asked what China is doing to reduce emissions and it is assumed that the answer is nothing. However, information gathered from three World Bank reports [1, 2, 3] indicate that governments around the world are taking action, China included:

In 2014, about 40 national and over 20 sub-national jurisdictions have already implemented or scheduled emissions trading schemes or carbon taxes. Together, these jurisdictions account for more than 22 percent of global emissions. Many more countries and jurisdictions are advancing preparation for pricing carbon. Together, these represent almost half of global Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions [4]. See the map below to find out where [5].

Here's the breakdown of what these countries are doing:

- 14 countries and one sub-national jurisdiction (BC, Canada) are implementing or have passed legislation for a direct carbon tax.
- 18 countries are taking steps to be in a state of "carbon pricing readiness" by 2016-2020.
- 35 countries (incl. 28 in the EU) and 20 subnational jurisdictions have adopted emissions trading (ETS) programs.

Looking at it slightly differently, only two out of the ten of the largest economies in the world do NOT have a carbon price: including our biggest trading partner the United States as well as Russia [6]. *Note this includes California, which has an Emissions Trading Scheme, accurately as the world's 10th largest economy instead of India [7].

Of special note in July 2014 India doubled its tax on coal to fund green energy projects [8]. As well, at the federal level Canada does not have a climate or energy plan [9]



This laser talk and the data tables it draws from can be [downloaded here](#)

References:

[1] "Putting a Price on Carbon with a Tax". The World Bank. June 3, 2014.

http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/SDN/background-note_carbon-tax.pdf

[2] World Bank Background Note “Carbon Pricing Readiness: Looking Ahead”. The World Bank. June 3, 2014
http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/SDN/background-note_carbon-pricing-readiness.pdf

[3] “Putting a Price on Carbon with an ETS”. The World Bank. June 3, 2014.
http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/SDN/background-note_ets.pdf

[4] “Statement: Putting a Price on Carbon”. The World Bank. June 3, 2014. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/pricing-carbon#1>

[5] “State & Trends Report Charts Global Growth of Carbon Pricing”. The World Bank. May 28, 2014.
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2014/05/28/state-trends-report-tracks-global-growth-carbon-pricing>

[6] “GDP (current US\$)”. World Development Indicators. World Bank. Retrieved 1 July 2014.
<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>

[7] “Widespread But Slower Growth in 2013”. Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Labor. June 11, 2014. Retrieved June 11, 2014. http://www.bea.gov/newsreleases/regional/gdp_state/2014/pdf/gsp0614.pdf

[8] “India Doubles Tax on Coal to Fund Clean Energy, Environmental Projects” July 20, 2014 retrieved July 31, 2014
<http://cleantechnica.com/2014/07/20/india-doubles-tax-coal-fund-clean-energy-environmental-projects/>

[9] Experts call for Moratorium on Oilsands Development Until Climate, Environmental Impacts Assessed. **Nature Commentary**. Wendy Palen et al, June 25, 2014, retrieved July 31, 2014
<http://www.nature.com/news/energy-consider-the-global-impacts-of-oil-pipelines-1.15434>

Communiqu'éclairs

Discours de motivation sur le prélèvement et le dividende

Une taxe sur les émissions carboniques sans incidence sur les recettes fonctionne ainsi:

- une taxe est imposée sur les combustibles à base de carbone, à la source (puits, mine, port de débarquement);
- cette taxe augmente chaque année de façon constante, de sorte que l'énergie propre se révélera plus économique que les combustibles fossiles dans dix ans;
- tous les fonds amassés sont redistribués équitablement aux citoyens canadiens;
- aux termes de ce plan, 66 % de tous les foyers entreront dans leurs frais ou recevront un chèque-dividende plus généreux que s'ils avaient défrayé le coût de plus en plus élevé de l'énergie, solution qui protège les citoyens pauvres et ceux de classe moyenne[1];
- une hausse prévisible du prix du carbone enverra un signal clair au marché, qui mobilisera les entrepreneurs et les investisseurs autour de la nouvelle économie de l'énergie propre;
- selon les estimations, la mise en œuvre de ces lois entraînera la création de plus de quatre millions d'emplois [2].

References

1. [Tax Shifts](#). 21 mars 2011. The Carbon Tax Center. Dernière consultation : 23 mai 2013.
2. [Building a Green Economy](#) 2010. Robertson, Joseph. Citizens Climate Lobby

Pourquoi souhaitons-nous une totale neutralité fiscale?

1. Un remboursement de 100 % fera en sorte que les deux tiers des ménages canadiens ne subiront pas d'effets ou seront avantagés par une augmentation des coûts de l'énergie.
2. Les membres du Parlement qui subissent des pressions pour ne pas augmenter les taxes peuvent tout de même appuyer une telle mesure.
3. Si, tout en augmentant régulièrement le prix de combustibles à base de carbone, nous éliminons aussi les subventions pour le secteur énergétique, nous permettons au marché de se mettre au travail sans que le gouvernement ait à choisir des gagnants et des perdants. Les investisseurs en capital de risque, les banques et les entrepreneurs, en percevant des signaux prévisibles quant aux prix, seront à l'origine d'innovations jamais vues, inimaginables dans certains cas. Un prix pour le carbone constitue la manière la plus efficace et la plus directe d'envoyer un signal clair en matière de prix, mieux que le feraient des subventions ou des mesures de rechange telles qu'une réglementation gouvernementale ou un système de plafonnement et d'échange.
4. Demander aux citoyens de limiter volontairement leur utilisation de combustibles fossiles quand d'autres ne choisiront peut-être pas de le faire peut être aussi démoralisant qu'inefficace. Pour maintenir l'appui du public pour un tel prix, nous devons stabiliser nos émissions de CO₂ et les citoyens devront en échange recevoir des dividendes appréciables.

Science fondamentale

1. le CO₂ emprisonne la chaleur;
2. la concentration de CO₂ est en hausse;
3. nous avons consommé deux fois plus de combustibles fossiles que ce qui est nécessaire pour causer l'élévation observée (le reste s'est retrouvé dans l'océan et en provoque l'acidification).

Nous connaissons la véracité du premier fait depuis plus de 150 ans (depuis 1859), grâce aux travaux du scientifique irlandais John Tyndall qui a bloqué du CO₂ dans un tube, y a fait pénétrer de la lumière et a découvert que la température était plus élevée en présence de CO₂[1, 2]. Le deuxième fait est avéré par des évaluations directes effectuées à l'aide de la courbe de Keeling, qui enregistrent actuellement 400 ppm de CO₂ dans l'atmosphère, une hausse par rapport aux 317 ppm enregistrées en 1958, au début des évaluations[3, 4]. Nous sommes au courant du troisième fait par le truchement des comptes des sociétés pétrolières, gazières et charbonnières. Ces sociétés consignent leurs ventes et, en supposant que tout le combustible vendu est consommé (une bonne hypothèse), vous aboutissez à une quantité suffisante de CO₂ fossile dans l'atmosphère pour obtenir le double de la hausse observée[5, 6]. Ces trois faits sont d'une telle évidence qu'ils étaient manifestes dès 1895, année où le chimiste Svante Arrhenius a commencé à prédire une élévation de la température entraînée par les ajouts de CO₂ dans l'atmosphère occasionnés par les activités anthropiques[7].

1. « John Tyndall (1820-1893) ». NASA Earth Observatory. Dernière consultation : 10 janvier 2011. URL : www.earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/Tyndall/
2. James Rodger Fleming (2005). [Historical Perspectives on Climate Change](#). Oxford University Press. p. 69–70. Disponible en ligne
3. R. F. Keeling, S. C. Piper, A. F. Bollenbacher et S. J. Walker, « Scripps CO₂ Program ». Dernière consultation : 24 mai 2013. URL : <http://scrippsco2.ucsd.edu>.
4. Lisa Welp et Ralph Keeling. « Now What? ». 20 mai 2013. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography at UC San Diego. Dernière consultation : 24 mai 2013. URL : <http://keelingcurve.ucsd.edu/now-what/>
5. Boden, T.A., G. Marland et R.J. Andres. 2009. Global, Regional, and National Fossil-Fuel CO₂ Emissions. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A. DOI 10.3334/CDIAC/00001. Disponible en ligne, à : http://cdiac.ornl.gov/trends/emis/overview_2006.html.
6. Sabine CL, Feely RA, Gruber N, Key RM, Lee K, Bullister JL, Wanninkhof R, Wong CS, Wallace DWR, Tilbrook B, Millero FJ, Peng TH, Kozyr A, Ono T, Rios AF. 2004. « The Oceanic Sink for Anthropogenic CO₂ ». *Science*, vol. 305. p 367-371
7. « Svante Arrhenius (1859-1927) ». NASA Earth Observatory. Dernière consultation : 24 mai 2013. URL : www.earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/Arrhenius/arrhenius_2.php

Une taxe de Pigou? Pourquoi pas?

Le 2 avril 2013, Lord Nicholas Stern, la Banque mondiale et le Fonds monétaire international ont convenu d'une chose : les changements climatiques constituent la plus grande menace économique du 21^e siècle¹. L'idée d'une taxe et de dividendes sur le carbone fait de plus en plus de chemin. De plus en plus d'experts politiques, y compris dans les cercles conservateurs, estiment qu'il s'agit là d'une mesure efficace pour corriger les distorsions dans le marché qui font des combustibles fossiles notre source d'énergie dominante.

Plusieurs économistes affirment que le libre marché constitue un arbitre équitable pour déterminer quels biens et quels services sont bénéfiques pour la société. Ce système cesse toutefois de fonctionner lorsque le prix d'un produit ne reflète pas son coût réel pour la société. C'est le cas notamment des combustibles fossiles, puisque leur usage implique des coûts considérables en matière de santé et de sécurité, sans compter les effets néfastes qu'ils provoquent sur l'environnement naturel et leur contribution aux phénomènes météorologiques destructeurs aggravés par le réchauffement planétaire.

Corriger une telle distorsion du marché exige un procédé que les économistes appellent une « taxe de Pigou ». Elle permettrait de stimuler l'efficacité énergétique et de favoriser l'émergence de sources d'énergie propres, en plus de réduire l'utilisation de combustibles à base de carbone.

Selon le Canadien David Frum, ancien rédacteur de discours pour le président George W. Bush : « De nouveaux emplois et de la croissance; une réduction des déficits, sans augmenter l'impôt sur le revenu; des taxes moins élevées pour les familles de la classe moyenne... un instrument peut y parvenir. Comment ne pas aimer l'idée d'une taxe sur le carbone²? »

Diana Carney, de *Canada 2020*, fait partie d'un nombre grandissant de Canadiens progressistes qui présentent des arguments irréfutables justifiant la création d'une taxe sur le carbone. En novembre 2013, à Ottawa, *Canada 2020* a tenu sa deuxième conférence sur les changements climatiques, sous le thème *The Politics of Climate Change and Climate of Politics*³ (La politique des changements climatiques et le climat politique).

La bonne nouvelle : nous pouvons mettre fin à cette défaillance du marché des combustibles fossiles sans préjudice pour notre économie.

Comment? En redonnant aux Canadiens un mécanisme de taxe et de dividendes sur le carbone.

¹ Howard Schneider, *World Bank chief says global warming threatens the planet and the poorest*, The Washington Post, 2 avril 2013 au www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/world-bank-chief-says-global-warming-threatens-the-planet-and-the-poorest/2013/04/02/caa73842-9ba7-11e2-9a79-eb5280c81c63_story.html (consulté le 8 mars 2014).

² David Frum, "A tax we could learn to love," *CNN*, 3 décembre 2012, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/03/opinion/frum-tax-energy/> (consulté le 8 mars 2014).

³ Canada 2020, "The politics of climate, and the climate of politics," *Canada 2020*, <http://canada2020.ca/event/the-politics-of-climate-and-the-climate-of-politics-in-canada/> (consulté le 8 mars 2014).

La différence entre la science et les chercheurs

Le processus d'évaluation par les pairs à l'aide duquel les résultats scientifiques sont évalués a fait ses preuves à maintes reprises. La crédibilité des nouvelles découvertes scientifiques est établie à la suite de processus d'examen rigoureux, d'abord par des experts du secteur, puis par les citoyens, alors que ceux-ci commencent à appliquer ces conclusions dans la vie de tous les jours. On ne compte plus les exemples où cette façon de faire a été utilisée. Ainsi, lorsque mes enfants étaient jeunes, nous avons souvent dû acheter des antibiotiques pour traiter des otites et jamais nous n'avons eu de doute sur leur efficacité. De même, nous faisons toute confiance à la science chaque fois que nous prenons l'avion : nous avons confiance que l'appareil volera. Il est donc impensable que le secteur des sciences traitant des changements climatiques ait été corrompu et s'inscrive hors du processus scientifique que l'on observe dans tous les aspects de nos vies.

Un seul scientifique, par contre, peut défendre des conclusions qui sont incompatibles avec le consensus scientifique. Le physicien Fred Singer⁴ constitue un bon exemple à ce titre. Il en sait plus sur le plan scientifique que je n'en saurai jamais de toute ma vie. Toutefois, en plus d'affirmer devant le Congrès américain que les émissions de CO₂ n'étaient pas la principale cause du réchauffement de la planète, il a aussi prétendu que fumer des cigarettes ne provoque pas le cancer⁵. Les scientifiques, à titre individuel, peuvent bien prétendre ce qu'ils veulent, que ce soit vrai ou non; mais ils ne trouveront jamais d'organismes scientifiques qui seront en accord avec leurs propos.

Jim Powell s'est engagé à démontrer que ceux qui nient l'existence des changements climatiques constituent des cas isolés. M. Powell, un auteur scientifique qui a siégé pendant 12 ans au National Science Board après y avoir été nommé par les présidents Ronald Reagan et George H.W. Bush, a analysé 13 950 articles revus par les pairs sur les changements climatiques, publiés de 1991 à 2012. De ce nombre, 24 seulement écartaient clairement l'activité humaine comme cause du réchauffement planétaire ou privilégiaient une cause autre que les émissions de CO₂ pour le réchauffement observé. Des 33 690 scientifiques qui ont écrit ces articles, 34 seulement ont participé à la rédaction des 24 articles en question. Cela veut donc dire qu'un scientifique spécialiste du climat sur 1 000 publiés en 21 ans a exclu l'activité humaine comme cause des changements climatiques.

⁴ Fred Singer," *Wikipedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fred_Singer (consulté le 3 mars 2014).

⁵ Fred Singer et Kent Jeffreys, *The EPA and the Science of Environmental Tobacco Smoke*, (ébauche : Alexis De Tocqueville Institution, 1994), www.legacy.library.ucsf.edu (consulté le 3 mars 2014).

Les effets du prix du carbone sur les producteurs agricoles

L'agriculture au Canada est largement tributaire du prix des combustibles fossiles pour le fonctionnement de la machinerie et la production des engrais. Une taxe sur le carbone augmenterait vraisemblablement le prix des combustibles fossiles.

Pour les agriculteurs, cependant, les répercussions d'une taxe sur le carbone ne sont pas aussi importantes, ni aussi volatiles que d'autres facteurs, surtout si cette taxe est minime et augmente graduellement, de manière prévisible, avec le temps. Au Canada, par exemple, on constate que le prix du carburant pour la machinerie agricole a augmenté de 25 % en 2011 par rapport à 2010. De plus, au cours de la même période, le prix des engrais a augmenté de 29 %[1]. Les prix des marchandises, qui déterminent le revenu que reçoivent les agriculteurs pour une période donnée, sont eux aussi très volatils[2].

Les effets d'une taxe sur le carbone seront minimes, si on le compare aux répercussions des changements climatiques sur l'activité agricole future à long terme si les émissions de CO₂ ne sont pas réduites. En mars 2013, un rapport de Canada 2020 concluait que « [traduction] Les conditions climatiques incertaines et les conditions météorologiques extrêmes sont des réalités incontestables pour l'avenir de l'agriculture au Canada, et même si des hausses de température et des taux élevés de CO₂ étaient bénéfiques au début, il est peu probable que ces effets positifs demeurent. De plus en plus de preuves tendent vers des seuils de température et de CO₂, au-delà desquels ces niveaux vont plafonner ou diminuer. Ces risques doivent être pris en charge et des politiques doivent être adoptées pour les réduire[3]. »

Rappelons également qu'une taxe sur le carbone offrira aux agriculteurs et aux éleveurs de bétail une possibilité sur le plan économique lorsque la demande en carburants sans carbone augmentera. Les responsables du développement de l'énergie éolienne louent des terres aux agriculteurs afin d'ériger des turbines. Des parcs solaires pourront aussi remplacer les champs cultivés qui ne tirent pas assez de revenus de l'agriculture traditionnelle.

En fin de compte, les coûts supplémentaires d'une taxe sur le carbone n'ont rien de comparable avec la volatilité associée aux changements climatiques. Une hausse graduelle et prévisible de la taxe sur le carbone donnera la chance aux agriculteurs de faire l'équilibre avec cette volatilité grâce à un apport financier régulier provenant de ressources renouvelables, que permet d'obtenir le partage de leurs terres.

[1]Agriculture et agroalimentaire Canada, Canada : achat de carburant et d'engrais dans les exploitations agricoles (mars 2012) Gouvernement du Canada, www.agr.gc.ca/fra/industrie-marches-et-commerce/statistiques-et-informat... (consulté le 5 avril 2014) [2]Agriculture et agroalimentaire Canada, Vue d'ensemble d'un système agricole et agroalimentaire canadien 2009 » Gouvernement du Canada. www.agr.gc.ca/fra/a-propos-de-nous/publications/publications-economiques... (consulté le 5 avril 2014) [3]Sophie Oliver, What does a changing climate mean for Canadian agriculture? Canada 2020, <http://canada2020.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Canada-2020-Analytical-C...> (consulté le 8 mars 2014)