

The science behind net zero

I have long made many important arguments against the policies the U.K. is following in the name of net zero. I have shown how closing down our own energy using industries only to import from elsewhere adds to world CO₂. I have pointed out that plugging an EV or heat pump into the grid may just lead to us burning more gas in a gas power station which creates more CO₂. I have shown how we will lose any well paid jobs and tax revenue as we rush to close down our domestic oil and gas production, close our steel works, undermine our refineries, petrochemical works, ceramics, aluminium, glass and other heavy energy using industries. I did not vote for the climate change targets as there was no proper costing or feasibility study.

Some of you want to make a case that far from being settled the science does not prove that serious global warming is happening from manmade CO₂. So this is your opportunity to summarise the case for that view or for the government counter. It would be useful if both sides could deal with the following points made in the debate when and where it is allowed.

1. Given there were periods of global warming and global cooling before mankind lived here, what caused those big changes? Could those forces change the climate again? Will they reinforce warming or will some cause cooling?
2. What allowance is made for natural CO₂, water vapour, solar intensity, volcanic activity and other causes of warming and cooling?
3. What tests have been performed on models to back test them against temperature data, and to check them at future dates against predictions?
4. Why do some models and most official commentary concentrate on manmade CO₂ to the exclusion of all the factors that did cause climate change before mankind arrived, and in history before the coal based Industrial Revolution and the population explosion got under way?
5. Why when seeking to combat manmade CO₂ on a national basis do they not recommend the U.K. stops growing its population as that is a major cause of extra manmade CO₂?
6. What is the total CO₂ impact of making battery electric cars including extracting the rare earths and metals through to disposing of the battery?

Great British Energy

Mr Miliband's desperate letter to National Grid seeking urgently a way to decarbonise U.K. electricity generation by 2030 and asking for the costs is very worrying. He spent 14 years in Opposition studying public policy. He set out how a faster drive to net zero would be central to Labour's policy. He told us it would drive growth and bring us plenty of new cheaper renewable

power, cutting our fuel bills. Now he reveals he never worked out how you could do it or how much it would cost.

This revelation doesn't just undermine Mr Miliband. It demolishes the central plank of the governments economic, energy and jobs strategy. How can National Grid reply without revealing three truths. There is no way the U.K. can fully decarbonise its electricity by 2030. The cost in investment money would be colossal. With big subsidies energy will be dearer not cheaper.

To get to net zero power generation the U.K. needs to replace the 4.8 GW of nuclear that is closing, and replace the gas turbine power which can be as much as 20 GW on a no wind or sun time. It needs to find a way to have enough renewable power to cover these huge losses even when there is little wind or sun. Without gas fired backup that needs an unplanned large amount of storage or hydrogen conversion. The latest bidding round has not provided nearly enough renewable power when you allow for the governments view that solar only delivers 12% of rated capacity and wind around 30%.

Replacing more than half our current generation costs tens of billions , as would putting in sufficient storage and a new hydrogen system, along with grid expansion. Dogger Bank wind farm was to cost £11 bn and would be considerably dearer starting today for 3.6 GW of gross capacity or maybe 1.4GW of average power. Hinckley Point for 3.2 GW of power will be over £40 bn. So 20 GW of replacement generation would be say £200 bn plus costs of grid and storage. Energy prices would need to increase with many more high price guarantees to bring forward the investment. £8.3 bn over five years from Great British Energy would make little difference given the vastness of the task.

[The Conservatives and Brexit](#)

The leadership contenders for the Conservatives need to own Brexit, be proud of Brexit and say how government should now use the Brexit freedoms to make us more prosperous and successful.

Brexit is only done in a legal sense, and is still encumbered with an EU Agreement that damages Northern Ireland. So far government has failed to change EU taxes, refused to amend their austerity economic controls, repealed very little of their excessive anti innovation and enterprise regulations, and has stayed wedded to some of their worst net zero, fishing and farming policies. Despite all this our service sector trade has boomed, we have joined the TPP, we are now saving £12 bn a year on contributions and have avoided our share of the huge Euro 800 bn debt the EU is now running up.

If we look at the history Conservatives won a decent majority in 2015 greatly helped by the pledge to hold an EU referendum. Some Conservatives helped secure a decisive win on a big turnout in the referendum, whilst the

leadership wrongly backed the losing side and then resigned. Mrs May tried to give us Brexit in name only and lost the majority as a result and from wider misjudgements in her manifesto in the stupid 2017 election. In 2019 Conservatives swept to a big win on the single slogan of Get Brexit done. In 2024 the party playing down Brexit and signing the damaging Windsor framework went down to a huge defeat for that and other related reasons. The failure to change EU economic style controls, the refusal to exercise our new ability to control our borders and bad Central banking led to a big loss of support on the back of an avoidable inflation and real income squeeze.

So history tells us the Conservatives back Brexit or they lose. It is curious that the only one of the 6 leadership hopefuls to have voted Leave, voted against the May sell outs and not supported the Windsor framework is removed first by the MPs. In the next rounds they need to make sure chosen candidates are now proud we can govern ourselves again, and keen to show how we can do so much better if we stop modelling our laws and taxes on a failing EU model. They should start by asking why GDP per head in the US is double the EU average.

It was notable in the last eight years how the most talented and dedicated Brexiteers like David Jones, William Cash, Iain Duncan Smith, Mark Francois, Craig Macinkay, Marcus Fysh and others were not used in Ministerial roles to drive through the benefits we all saw from the freedoms.

Budget responsibility

It is a farce that yesterday the government put a Bill through the Commons to "ensure" budget responsibility. It requires the Chancellor to commission an OBR report and forecast when she makes fiscal announcements on spending and or taxes. It is a farce because the Chancellor has announced large additional spending plans on nationalised industries and on public sector wages, over and above the allowed for rises in the last OBR budget assessment. We have not been offered any OBR forecast or comment on the possible inflationary effects of the pay award or of the enlarged spending plans.

It is a farce because the Bill does not course impose any penalty for non compliance on the responsible Minister or government. There will only be budget responsibility if the Chancellor wants it and imposes it. She will decide. If she wants to be responsible she does not need an Act of Parliament to make her so. If she wants to be highly political and stuff more money into public sector wages and nationalised businesses she will be able to do so without penalty.

From the time of New Labour onwards there have been too many laws and targets purporting to bind the government, and not enough concerted and sustained Ministerial action to tackle the underlying problems. This kind of legislation is at best silly and at worst as with some of targets damaging.

Labour enact nationalisation of a largely nationalised rail industry

The last government lived with a largely nationalised railway. It inherited public ownership of all the tracks, , signals and stations. It continued a regulatory control over most fares and all timetables. It added to the number of train operating companies run by the state as franchises ended or ran out of money.

The new government wants to show its Union bosses it still believes in nationalisation so it put a Bill through the Common yesterday that instructs the Secretary of State who designed the Bill not to use private sector companies in future or to have any competitive challenge to the state incumbents. It continues the bizarre Blair inspired idea of legislation to bind Ministers with no penalties for failure and of course the daily opportunity to simply change the law if it no longer suits. The last government did this too, setting targets that it could not guarantee to hit on net zero for example.

The Bill is a shoddy piece of political signalling. Why shouldn't the railways seek private sector bids to run parts of the railway better with less cost for taxpayers? When did a monopoly producer lower prices and offer better service than competing providers? How can the government control the run away costs of the largely nationalised industry as it moves to complete public sector ownership?

Last year the railways cost taxpayers £33 bn in losses and capital spending, all to be found from a stretched national budget. This Bill will come at further excessive cost to taxpayers.

Where was the Shadow Spokeswoman highlighting the dangers to passengers and taxpayers? Where was the case reminding us of the great success of Hull trains, the one example where a challenge to the monopoly was allowed? Where the reminder of the colossal waste and cost overrun of HS 2, a truly nationalised wannabe railway which will never get to the north of England despite that being the main point of the plan!