



by Malcolm Farr  
21 Jun 06:00am

# Big stink brewing over dumpanomics

FILED UNDER: CARBON TAX, COUNCILS, ECONOMY, GARBAGE, LANDFILL, POLITICS

199 COMMENTS

Recommend 0

The final battle against the carbon pricing scheme before its July 1 introduction will be amid the lumpy terrain and unpleasant pong of suburban garbage dumps. Local government will be fighting to the end the application of the \$23-a-tonne penalty for carbon emissions which will be attracted by this usually unattractive community facility.



The circling ibis portend a tipping point in the carbon tax debate... sorry, that was pretty bad.

Meanwhile, the Government will be insisting the same territory, the local landfill site, will become a boon for municipal councils as it will lead to money making prospects for them.

Rubbish tips are an ideal political battleground because while most suburban types don't own an aluminium refinery or a coal mine, they do cart their clippings and other waste to the tip regularly.

And while the landfill sites of just 33 rubbish dumps out of 565 councils nationally will be caught up in the carbon pricing scheme, they are a frontline community resource.

Miners are allowing cries of dread about carbon pricing, but just yesterday giant Rio Tinto announced a big expansion in iron ore projects, and steel town Whyalla, one of the places said to be wiped from the economic map by the carbon scheme, is lobbying for an expansion of its airport.

While the question of electricity prices is not as clear-cut as the Opposition might insist, the matter of charges at the tip is as obvious as cash-short councils can and will make them, on rates notices or billboards at the dump.

While the scheme will affect only landfill sites which emit more than 25,00 tonnes of methane a year - the big ones - it indicates the reach and intrusion of the carbon scheme into basic community assets.

The Gold Coast Mayor Tom Tate late last month said his council would not pay the carbon price when the bill arrives in July next year.

While this might cost his council more in legal fees to fight the Commonwealth in court than any savings from refusing to pay the carbon invoice, Ald Tate has become a local government hero.

The economics of rubbish dumps are not as simple as the old equation of garbage-in, gas-out might indicate.

Yesterday the Australian Landfill Owners' Association wrote to parliamentary secretary for climate change Mark Dreyfus to lay out some of its research on how the scheme could warp competition.



de to Ecuador, me of the "Julian volution" - this is aption

A  
guide  
to  
Ecuac  
some  
of  
he  
Julian  
Revol

100



ik brewing over npanomics - this a caption

Big  
stink

# Big stink brewing over dumpanomics

199



Good argument  
it arguments are  
good - this is a  
position

## There is a good argument that good arguments are good

89

It reported that in the Adelaide area there are two large sites clearly over the 25,000 tonne threshold, three smaller sites that are just below the threshold, and a further two small country sites.

"Under the current arrangements the two larger sites cannot pass through their CPM carbon costs without risking a significant loss of business to the smaller sites," said the ALOA letter.

A second example was Hobart, where there is a relatively new regional landfill site and two smaller council-owned tips.

"Notwithstanding its intention to install a gas collection system shortly the regional landfill expects to have emissions above the threshold whilst the two smaller sites are below the threshold," said the letter.

"This situation is preventing the larger regional site from passing carbon pass-through costs to its clients."

And same for a third example in regional Victoria, where between Bendigo and Echuca landfill services are provided by a privately owned regional landfill and a number of smaller country landfills.

"The regional site estimates it will exceed the threshold in 2018 and as a consequence needs to initiate a partial carbon cost recovery from 1 July 2012. The operation of the smaller neighbouring sites is frustrating the regional sites ability to recover its carbon liability costs," said the ALOA.

"These three examples demonstrate the need for the prescribed distance rule to be re-instated in the legislation and as a result ALOA calls on the Government to bring forward the review of the prescribed distance so that unfair competition between covered and uncovered sites can be avoided."

But it's the council sites where the issue will be felt most.

Mark Dreyfus is attempting to convince councillors they have a lucrative opportunity under the scheme to make some money by harnessing the methane and selling the carbon credits on the open market.

They could capture the gas and turn it into electricity to earn Renewable Energy Certificates which also have financial rewards attached.

"Good examples of councils taking a lead in these areas are Tweed Heads which has reduced its gas pollution so significantly, it will not have to pay any carbon price, and Newcastle City Council which generates enough electricity from its captured gas to power 3000 homes," said Mr Dreyfus in a statement.

Ultimately the Government returns to its household assistance payments which it says will compensate for increased tip charges.

"Rate rises associated with landfill, if any, are estimated to be between 13 cents and 40 cents per household, which is covered by the federal governments average household assistance of \$10.10 per household per week, delivered through pension increases, family payments and tax cuts," said Mr Dreyfus.

Councillors are not dills. They see the opportunity. But they need time to invest in the the capital works to take advantage of those opportunities for decades to come.

Until they get that they will turn their rubbish dumps into carbon pricing martyrs.

[Recommend](#)

Be the first of your friends to recommend this.

Most commented

- 732 And humans said: Let there be marriage! And there was... We must keep chaplains in our schools to help our kids  
Punch on: open thread 21/06/2012 173
- 595 So it turns out plenty of us are Dumb, Drunk and Racist  
Punch on: Open thread 20/06/2012  
Punch on: Open thread 19/06/2012
- 452 My accidental Sunday morning with Cardinal Pell  
199 Big stink brewing over dumpanomics 199
- 225

---

199 COMMENTS

**Nathan says:**

06:29am | 21/06/12

Nup doesn't matter Carbon Tax is bad there is no upside at all never will be. Spiralling energy costs over the last 10yrs is also the fault of the Carbon tax. A company closed down last week that was also the fault of the carbon tax.

Reply

**L. says:**

07:38am | 21/06/12

"Nup doesn't matter Carbon Tax is bad there is no upside at all never will be."

So Nathan, the real life, measurable upside to the Crabon tax is..???

**Against the Man says:**

07:46am | 21/06/12

You finally it Nathan!

sarcasm noted 😏

It isn't about the compo it is about the lie, have a nice weekend!

**Rocksteady says:**

08:05am | 21/06/12

I detect a hint of sarcasm.

Do laugh when people blame all the price rises (70% in 2 years for NSW) on the carbon tax, when it can only affect prices from July and even then its only half of the 16% approved increase.

**Denny says:**

08:21am | 21/06/12

Spiralling energy costs over the last 10 years have not been the fault of the carbon tax but they are the fault of inept greedy labor governments who ripped money out without spending anything on upkeep and upgrades. You can add the mindless green schemes that were devised by labor.

Either way you look at it, the increase in costs is a direct result of labor mismanagement. And instead of punishing the masterminds, labor promote Bob Carr to the senate and give Peter Beattie an AM. What a joke.

the time to pay the piper is fast approaching for federal labor. They have already paid the price in QLD and NSW.

**Elli says:**

08:42am | 21/06/12

The increase in energy costs is largely because the now privatised electricity companies have had to build so much new infrastructure. Partly, that might be because of lack of investment in infrastructure under government ownership, but you can't ignore the staggering increase in demand for electricity. Why so much demand? Increasing population, the popularity of the McMansion with its ducted aircon and heated swimming pool, 3 big screen tvs in every home. More demand for power (from us, not government) means more infrastructure, which means higher bills. You want your power costs to go down, reduce your demand on the grid.

**ZSRenn says:**

09:20am | 21/06/12

@ Nathan I hope you get paid well for getting up so early in the morning. I do think though that in an effort to save emissions you could wait until first light before you get to work.

In fact if all Labor / Green commentators were to do their part, by not posting before they had natural light, the carbon footprint might be reduced by the same amount globally as that which the Carbon Tax is planned to do. 0.0%.

I thought everybody knew that the rise in prices over the last decade was mainly due to the expansion into green technologies that various state governments had made. 10 years of use and development without any technological gain. Oh I see your being sarcastic.

I am kind of wondering from Mal's story how pulling Iron Ore out of the ground to sell to China has anything to do with the Carbon Tax. Last time I checked the tax was against Co2 not FeMno4.

Another thing that puzzles me is why it is methane that the councils are being taxed for not Co2. Laugh at my ignorance if you will, but do we now have a CH4 tax or does the tax apply only to the single carbon atom and they get a reduction for the 4 Hydrogen atoms. I find it laughable that government rubbish tips are the major polluters in the nation.

Was there not enough company's polluting that they would be charged? Did Julia and her tribe of idiots not realize this at time of implementation? Or is this why the figure was reduced to 500 polluters? There is just not enough pollution created in Australia to warrant this Tax. This would explain the blue skies as opposed to China.

Ok so my power bill is only going up by about \$3:00 this year because of the carbon tax designed to save 0.0% of global emissions. Is this just my bill or everybody's bill? If it is everybody's bill how much is the rise for manufacturers of products sold in Australia. Their increase must be massive.

I assume then that I will have to pay more in the cost of goods and services purchased and will I get compensation for these increased costs. If I am purchasing more for my goods and services then I assume that the major polluters are paying more for theirs. Will this mean more price rises and if these local governments spend money to research CH4 capture (as now we have a CH4 tax) will my rates go up to meet these costs and if my rates go up will not the rates of the businesses in my district. I would assume that these businesses will have to raise their prices to meet their increased costs and if they raise their prices, will not those polluters need to raise their prices again to meet the rise in prices?

Oh it's just to confusing in an effort to save 0.0% of global emissions. Maybe someone needs to say. "There will be no Carbon Tax under a government I lead"

### **Gianna says:**

09:22am | 21/06/12

@ Denny 08:21am | 21/06/12

Very well said. The anger towards the carbon tax is the last straw for those of us who have helplessly watched our bills getting bigger over the decade of mismanagement by labor govts all around Australia, with nothing to show for it, other than pie in the sky green schemes that have never come to fruition.

### **ZSRenn says:**

09:33am | 21/06/12

@ Elli, Cheers thanks. I will call, my 74 year old, mum now and tell her to turn off that 1 bar heater she is using.

### **Rosie says:**

10:03am | 21/06/12

Yep no stopping Abbott from traveling the country preaching bad bad toxic carbon tax, elect me I will get rid of it as soon as I replace Gillard as PM."

Yep and when he arrives in Whyalla he will be stressing even stronger the same thing to the miners that are crying dread about the carbon tax. Abbott is not going to care about Rio Tinto's latest announcement of an expansion in iron ore and steel projects because it will all happen under his leadership. Yep again Abbott feels strongly that if he isn't given the chance to repeal the carbon and mining tax, Whyalla will be wiped from the economic map. The lobbying for an expansion of Whyalla's airport will go ahead because the only certainty, is that Australia has is a change of Govt next year, one that won't have a carbon or mining tax.

Yep Mr Farr according to Abbott and the Coalition Whyalla will be wiped out if the Greens had their way with the carbon tax at \$40 a ton and increasing every year until we weren't relying on the coal industry but renewable energy for our electricity. If you and others want to take it literally so be it.

A change of Govt will not only do away with a mining and carbon tax but will bring back confidence, stability, sustainability etc for Australia's future prosperity.

### **james says:**

10:31am | 21/06/12

Living in climate change denial must be so frustrating.

### **Blind Freddy says:**

10:34am | 21/06/12

@ZSRenn

"I will call, my 74 year old, mum now and tell her to turn off that 1 bar heater she is using."

I would help my poor ol' mum if she were ever to find herself in that position, I wouldn't be relying on the government. The

CO2 price hasn't even come in yet and she has already been neglected by ZSRenn and family - 73 and reduced to using a one-bar heater. Where is her family, where is the love? Very sad.

### **Borderer says:**

10:51am | 21/06/12

Elli,

You are obviously unaware of what happened in Qld during the floods. Demand on the grid dropped due to substations being taken off line as they were overwhelmed by flood water. Power companies upped their prices as less demand caused them to have spread thier fixed costs over smaller usage. Please try a new solution.

### **Markus says:**

12:23pm | 21/06/12

@Borderer, spot on. If electricity demand goes up, prices go up. If demand goes down, prices go up. There is no scenario that results in lower power bills.

Another prime example was when water rates in the ACT went up during the drought period prior to 2010. Current water stocks in dams are now so high that they are selling the excess off to NSW, but there is buckleys chance of that resulting in local water rates going back down.

### **acotrel says:**

12:45pm | 21/06/12

Tell me something all you climate change deniers and growth addicts. Where will the energy come from to regain all the resources which end up in landfill?. What I am talking about is entropy. Once all of the resources are evenly distributed in landfill around the planet, the only way to get them back into concentrated form is by humungus input of energy. I cannot imagine that we will ever reach a steady state sustainable global economy, while the current paradigm remains unchanged.

### **Johnny D says:**

02:00pm | 21/06/12

ZSRenn,

An interesting take on some of the issues you have there. let me try to help you with some of your confusion.

Green initiatives being the sole cause of price increases is a little bit of a stretch. When you have existing infrastructure that is built for a certain demand, when that demand increases, now this is the tricky bit, you have to spend money on more infrastructure. Power companies have not been in the charity business for some time now and so that price is passed on.

The carbon Tax is a tax against green house gases and indeed Ozone depleting gases as well. This hopefully allays your suspicions about methane, whatever they were.

Mr Farr did get a little of topic there with the Iron miners, but who can blame him. He was lucky not to have linked it to those illegal immigrants.

Putting the tax on the top 500 is following a pretty simple concept. It is sometimes called the 80/20 rule, where you typically find 80% of the problem can be linked to 20% of the contributors. Try it some time, you'll be amazed how consistent it is.

Now your magic number of 0.0% reduction in the world. Apart from the fact that it is extremely difficult for an Australian government to legislate in other countries, the premise of this change is that we get a head start on the rest of the world when it comes to dealing with climate change in a real way. Now this takes a leap of faith that 95% of the scientists in the world are not conspiring to destroy the world economy by making up the fact that the earth has been heating up in line with man's ability to produce carbon dioxide (and others like methane which do contribute, don't forget that!).

There will be price rises yes. This is actually part of the mechanism to reduce the consumption. Ingenius isn't it! The government figured that asking polluters to please stop polluting wouldn't work and so they have built in a monetary incentive for them to reduce their emissions. And the real genius of this is that the same applies to you and me. We can reduce our costs by using less. Ta daaaa!

Sorry for the patronizing tone, but i figured you'd stop readin when you realized I was arguing against your point and needed to have fun while getting my point across.

### **ZSRenn says:**

02:00pm | 21/06/12

@ James, please show me one commentator above you that is denying Climate Change.

Most just think this is an expensive ridiculous scheme that will only save 0.0% of global emissions. Now if it was scheme that did actually reduce CO2, then that would be something but it doesn't.

They couldn't even find 500 CO2 polluters in the country and had to switch to local governments producing CH4

It is just another example of the worst government in Australian History at work.

PS I had to laugh last night when I saw Julia placed, for the G20 photo shoot, behind Barrack. Obama where she could not be seen or heard.

### **ZSRenn says:**

02:24pm | 21/06/12

@ Blind Freddie. i was obviously being sarcastic but to deny there are not pensioners in this position shows your lack of empathy for those less well to do.

### **Esteban says:**

02:28pm | 21/06/12

Acotrel. There are plenty of what you refer to as "climate change deniers" that are not addicted to growth.

It is actually a bit tricky of you to link them in the first place. You are insinuating that if you would like a stable population then you better get on board with man made climate change and a carbon tax.

Are you suggesting that a carbon tax will moderate population growth/

### **Daz says:**

03:03pm | 21/06/12

According to a paper, available on the ABS website called "Australia's Environment: Issues and Trends, January 2010" (there may be a more recent one) nearly 15% of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions come from the agricultural sector.

Of this percentage nearly 60% comes from "enteric fermentation" or farting by cattle and sheep. This also pushes up our per capita emissions way over other countries that don't have so many cattle and sheep.

What I'd like to know is how did they measure this? And who pays the carbon tax on all these farts? And should we start taxing human farts as well?

### **ZSRenn says:**

03:23pm | 21/06/12

@ Johnny D you're new here aren't you?

The Green initiatives have been a total waste of time and have done nothing but add to the cost of Electricity. Trying to bury those costs in spin about maintenance of infrastructure is just another example of the patronizing that the Australian people have to incur

The whole argument was about a CO2 tax for the entire debate and had nothing to do with Methane until Julia and the worst government in Australian history realised that they could not find enough CO2 polluters to meet the already paid rebates and then they added it. Your argument that it was always included is more patronizing spin that the Australian people have to incur.

80/20 rule. What is this kindergarten? You show yourself to be a welded on with another example of patronizing spin that the Australian people have to incur.

The "Build it and they will come" argument goes out the window when you consider that China, India and others have already increased their CO2 output more than the 0.0% and dozens of other countries have scrapped similar plans due to cost and disinterest. The "Build it and they will come" argument is patronizing spin that the Australian people have to incur.

Assuming that I do not read arguments against me is patronizing spin that I have to incur.

This ponzi scheme will do nothing but redistribute wealth and force Australian manufacturing, which is already in trouble, offshore. It is ill thought out and already the cracks are beginning to appear.

In the words of Bob Brown!

"Australians are smarter than this and they do not like to be patronised!"

### **Mouse says:**

04:33pm | 21/06/12

ZSRenn, just FYI, apparently Gillard is only going to slug 300 companies and councils now, not the 1,000, sorry, 500 as before. Don't worry though, there will probably not be a shortfall in the revenue they were expecting, meaning that all promised handouts will continue, for this year anyway, and they won't have to raise the \$300B ceiling again. I know they

haven't been too good in the past with their financial predictions but we have to give them the benefit of the doubt this time....

don't we????

<http://www.skynews.com.au/topstories/article.aspx?id=761528&vId=3325202>

Combet defends this position and apparently has been saying for some time that the numbers would drop. He has given a list of councils affected. Mine isn't on there but we have already been told by our local council that rubbish pick ups and rates will rise to cover their increased carbon tax costs.

<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/political-news/carbon-tax-slug-for-ratepayers-20120615-20env.html>

Sounds like they have it all under control...I'm feeling better already!!! :o/

### **Johnny D says:**

05:23pm | 21/06/12

ZSRenn,

I am impressed that you read an argument against you. I am not impressed however with your playing the man and not the argument rebuttle. A lot of what you say is very much your opinion and I am sure that the rest of Australia are more than capable of making their own mind up without your telling them what they think.

Can you substantiate that the green initiatives were all of the cost and infrastructure wasn't?

What is the point of taxing CO2 only when many other gases have the same effect?

Kindergarten is a pretty good example of your debating style.

Tell me how the tax is ill thought out without the name calling and wild assumptions and I will be here to hang on your every word.

### **ZSRenn says:**

06:11pm | 21/06/12

@ Johnny D Enough with the leftist stop mechanisms. You write a 8 paragraph mono-tribe patronising me and when I reply you call me for playing the man and not the ball. Come on! if you can't stand the heat stay out of the kitchen.

70% of the voters in the latest polls, and for many polls before that, agree with me, so yes I think they have it pretty good, without my help, I agree.

Stop putting words in my mouth as this is just more patronising spin I never said that the green initiatives were all of the cost and infrastructure wasn't? I objected to your downplaying the role green initiatives played in the massive increases in electricity costs.

A personal insult follows, another leftist stop mechanism in play.

How it is ill thought out? Sorry I haven't got time unless the punch want me to write a 5 part series and pay me but lets start with we will tax the topp 1000 companies, no the top 500 companies, no the top 300 companies and some councils. The tax rate will be \$40 / tonne no \$ 35/ tonne. No \$20 / tonne. Ok here it is at \$23 / tonne but the costing is at \$30/ tonne.

Shall I go on?

### **PJ says:**

06:33pm | 21/06/12

Any argument that the carbon tax is a good thing is decimated by the fact that the Gillard Government has been running round 'compensating' all industry sectors, including the big polluters and 70 percent of Australians, to protect them from the Carbon tax tsunami they created.

Any tax on business has always been a strangle hold on business growth and opportunity development in the history of the industrial world.

the Rio G20 disappointed Gillard, because it showed her that all other countries put their economies first. Unfortunately, Gillard has sabotage ours with the carbon tax.

Job losses every week for the past 9 months running up to the taxes launch as employers seek to reduce their new cost base. God knows how many planned new jobs have been canned.

### **PJ says:**

06:35pm | 21/06/12

@ZSRenn

Captain Awesome, no credits for the marvelous Suki Yeung?

### **PJ says:**

06:42pm | 21/06/12

whilst some companies will not be slugged with having to buy carbon credits to operate, everybody gets an electricity bill. For months now we've been making adjustments to company systems and processes to past the costs down the line.

### Little Joe says:

06:48pm | 21/06/12

@ Acotrel

But methane is not the lowest form of entropy for carbon ..... that is CO2 ..... and it is exactly what all the methane emissions from landfill will become in 10 years as it degrades in the atmosphere.

But you should realise that many councils are building complete recycling systems .... a new one is nearly completed in Grafton ..... literally zero waste and zero emissions

### Terry2 says:

06:45am | 21/06/12

Malcolm,I think I understand the carbon pricing scheme that takes effect from 1 July although I am ambivalent about the impact it will have on emitters who pass on the tax to consumers: what motivation do they have to cut their emissions ? What troubles me is that there may very well be a change of government next year and we are told that the carbon pricing scheme will be scrapped forthwith and replaced by another carbon reduction strategy. Can you, Malcolm, or anybody fill in the gaps: what exactly is the LNP policy and how is it preferable to carbon pricing/taxation ?

Reply

### Achmed says:

07:50am | 21/06/12

@Terry2..the Abbott policy is to give taxpayer money to the polluters from the budget. This was costed at \$1300 per household in 2011. So Abbott will need to find that money in the budget by cutting spending on other things such as health, education, infrastructure. Or he will need to increase taxation.

Why would anyone trust businesses with taxpayer money? I'll make the analogy..businesses had access to taxpayer money for the failed pink batts scheme. look at how they rorted and stole taxpayer money from that scheme. Why would we trust businesses to have that access and why would we trust any Govt to manage such a scheme?

Part of his carbon plan is to plant trees. Based on the number of trees he requires an area the size of Tasmania. Where he will find this land, how much it will cost to purchase, how much it will cost to purchase the trees and pay for them to be planted has not been revealed. Does he intend to use land that is currently used to produce our food crop or is he planning to plant them where even nature could not succeed?

People need to be reminded that Abbott stood with Howard in 2007 and was in favour of an ETS. Abbott is quoted as saying the best way to price carbon is with a tax. They also need to understand that the LNP under Abbott is committed to the same level of carbom reduction as Labor.

### Gus says:

09:05am | 21/06/12

'I am ambivalent about the impact it will have on emitters who pass on the tax to consumers: what motivation do they have to cut their emissions ?'

Companies can choose to either clean up the emissions or pay for the carbon permits.

If the cost of abatement is less than \$23 per ton the company will choose to clean up their emissions (or offset them like the Tweed council), if the cost of abatement is more than \$23 per ton the company will choose to buy the emissions permits (pay the Carbon tax) and continue to pollute.

Both put upward pressure on carbon intensive goods and services which decreases demand for those products and increases demand for substitutes that are less carbon intensive.

Many of the products that will increase in price, e.g. using the tip, are not price sensitive in the short term because it takes time to build the infrastructure required to offset or abate. Hence the justification for household compensation.

### james says:

10:38am | 21/06/12

Terry.

To quote a liberal party minister on the cost of direct action.

\$2.1 Billion per annum to 2020 = \$14.7 billion in total if commenced next year to make the 5% reduction.

\$18.1 billion per annum to achieve an 80% reduction.



The idea of the policy is to plant more trees, more carbon in the soil, buyout dirty coal power stations, and give high polluting industries money to reduce pollution.

### Little Joe says:

08:42pm | 21/06/12

Hey James,

They expect China to increase their CO2 Emissions by 50% in a few decades, and India's is expected to increase CO2 Emissions at a faster rate.

Put your head back in the sand mate

### cheap white trash says:

10:33pm | 21/06/12

Easy fixed Terry,i will put it as simple as i can,Its CRAP,and if Tony is smart,he will scrap the whole lot, Carbon Tax ETS bullshit,and get back to

Reality,if any Brain Dead Moron thinks a Tax or Ets is going to fix the worlds Climate,is a Deluded Fool.

### Against the Man says:

06:49am | 21/06/12

Lovin the Gillard carbon tax lie and the sad state our resident ALP nurse has sunk to: beg, beg, paranoid android 😊

Reply

### The pit tier says:

09:31am | 21/06/12

You. In a nutshell. How sad you are.

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=troll>

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=sock+puppet>

### no carbon tax says:

10:52am | 21/06/12

keep it up atm they know they cant win and r gettin desperate if 80% via the galaxy poll want no carbon tax the Gillard government is a pure sham

### sunny says:

08:44pm | 21/06/12

"r gettin desperate if 80% via the galaxy poll want no carbon"

You conservatives live and die by what the majority think. Pity you. The Gillard govt. focus on carbon emissions has seen us (without any detriment to our economy) understand the impact we have on the environment through (in some sectors) the over consumption of emissions based energy. Gillard has stood her ground on this policy and she is stronger for it. You under-estimate the number of people that want us to reign in our detrimental effects on our environment! There IS a better way - it's called renewable energy, you might as well accept it.

### Against the Man says:

10:09pm | 21/06/12

Sunny if Gillard was really sincere she would take it to an election. She lies, back stabs and screws over people. The reality is that Labor is over, finished, over 😊

Gillard's selfishness did the Coalition a great deed, enjoy. I know I will 😊

### Christian Real says:

06:14am | 22/06/12

Before the last Federal Election Julia Gillard promised to "Put a price on Carbon",Julia Gillard has "put a price on carbon", therefore she has not lied.

The only lie is that from Tony Abbott, his Opposition, the radio shock jocks and those imbeciles who continue to echo "Carbon Tax" and perpetuate that lie.

It wasn't that long ago that Tony Abbott himself said "If you want to put a price on carbon, why not just do it with a simple tax"

It was not that long ago that Tony Abbott said "Don't believe everything I say"

And it was not that long ago that Tony Abbott said: "The statements that need to be taken absolutely as gospel truth are those carefully prepared scripted remarks."

The bottom line is that Tony Abbott can continue his misleading rants about it being a Carbon tax, his admiring and ardent supporters can continue to echo and chant 'Carbon Tax', but in reality, that does not make it the truth, and never will make it the truth for Abbott and for those that support and condone his deceit.

### **Bertrand says:**

*06:52am | 21/06/12*

As soon as I read the headline I thought, 'why don't they start investing in methane capture technology then and start generating power from the dump's emissions'?

Good to see that was the same conclusion Farr came to, although his caveats about taking time to invest and establish this sort of power generation is also true.

But isn't that the point of the carbon tax... to encourage investment in low emissions technologies? People who can only see negatives in a carbon price are stuck in a very 20th century view of energy policy.

Reply

### **L. says:**

*07:41am | 21/06/12*

"As soon as I read the headline I thought, 'why don't they start investing in methane capture technology then and start generating power from the dump's emissions'?"

Because to \$\$ cost / Kw generated would be 5 times the cost you pay now..?

### **TimB says:**

*08:05am | 21/06/12*

"But isn't that the point of the carbon tax... to encourage investment in low emissions technologies?"

And for what has to be the millionth time, if these technologies are so great then you don't \*need\* a tax to encourage investment.

They didn't have to come up with a horseshoe tax to get people to invest in cars. People switched because it was a better option.

The same principle applies here.

### **Anthony of WA says:**

*08:21am | 21/06/12*

Bertrand, sounds great, let us know when you round up some capital make an agreement with a council and start generating some of that green power! No wait you want someone else to risk their money on this low emissions technology.

### **Elli says:**

*08:47am | 21/06/12*

My local council already has a methane capture power plant at the local tip, which is why it won't be affected by the carbon tax. It's been running for about 5 years now, and while it doesn't produce a lot of power it's still enough to supply the tip itself, the recycling centre and the local sports centre. I don't know exactly how much that adds up to in savings, but since they introduced it without this added 'incentive' I guess it must make financial sense! Hope other councils follow suit.

### **Bertrand says:**

*08:50am | 21/06/12*

The responses here are demonstrative of the myopic worldview of people who don't understand concepts such as externalities in business, the role of market mechanisms to shift behaviour, or the direction of 21st century energy technology.

Currently methane emissions from these waste sites are costs that councils are able to externalise. Putting a price marker

on these emissions is creating a new cost it is simply shifting the cost of these emissions back to the organisation that produces them and away from society as a whole. Once you remove the hidden subsidies of current business practices you make other systems of doing things more competitive.

The bonus is that investment in green energy technologies means we as a nation are putting ourselves in a position to profit from these technologies in the future.

As I stated on another thread earlier this week, the best chance for Australian manufacturing is for us to become a world leader in green energy technologies. Whether people are willing to admit it or not this is going to be a highly profitable sector this century.

Take a look at Germany. They have one of the world's most profitable manufacturing sectors and the world's most profitable green energy sector. It is such backwards thinking to resist market mechanisms that could make us a world leader in what is going to be a massive growth sector.

### **PsychoHyena says:**

08:57am | 21/06/12

@Elli same situation here, they fall under the CPS but won't actually have to pay much if any because they use capture and burn the methane produced to run a fairly hi-tech facility. Only thing that surprises me is that they're not doing it on a larger scale and putting some back into the grid, but then maybe the idea is to keep the tip powered through this scheme for many years rather than make money.

### **L. says:**

09:16am | 21/06/12

"The responses here are demonstrative of the myopic worldview of people who don't understand concepts such as externalities in business"

It's a pity altering 'business concepts' can't change the laws of physics.. But that is the stance of people like you Bertrand. Simply tax something, and hey presto... A 'green solution' will magically be found..

### **Bertrand says:**

09:59am | 21/06/12

@L : using a market mechanism was originally Howard's policy. Creating a framework for a carbon market is a policy that is most in line with orthodox economic thinking. It is a more cost effective way to reduce emissions and encourage investment than Abbot's policy, which sits far to the left of establishing a carbon market.

### **Pickles... The Drummer says:**

10:15am | 21/06/12

@TimB nailed it. I know my council back home looked into this tech over 5 years ago (not sure if implemented) and Newcastle installed this prior to the carbon tax. If it makes sense a company will do it, and probably has already done it. If its cost prohibitive then no company in the sector will do it and they will all pass the cost on to the consumer, so no one wins in the end, not even the environment.

### **Blind Freddy says:**

10:38am | 21/06/12

@Elli

Same here. It's been happening for years.

### **TimB says:**

11:03am | 21/06/12

"Currently methane emissions from these waste sites are costs that councils are able to externalise."

And by that logic, the CO2 that you breathe out every minute is a cost that \*you've\* been able to externalise.

Should the government be taxing you for breathing?

More to the point, please tell us what this external cost is exactly and show the working for your figures. Explain how X amount of CO2 causes \$Y worth of damage. Then explain how this figure has been linked to the tax.

I'll be willing to bet that you cannot, because your vaunted 'external cost' has nothing to do with the tax apart from being an excuse. The price point itself has been chosen to artificially influence the market.

**Borderer says:**

11:04am | 21/06/12

Elli,

The council can do this kind of power plant purely on the basis that they can justify it as part of their environmental spending.

Fact is, if there was a serious commercial dollar in it, the business sector would have been all over it.

**L. says:**

11:06am | 21/06/12

"Creating a framework for a carbon market is a policy that is most in line with orthodox economic thinking."

That's the problem Bertrand... "economic thinking' isn't a science, thus not bound by the laws of physics... Power generation engineering is.

Offer a viable baseload power generation solution... not 'economic thinking' please.

By the way.. Australial consumes 18 terra watts of power at it's lowest point every day (03:00am). How does the 'economic thinking' suggest we produce that..??

**james says:**

11:34am | 21/06/12

What sort of alternative do we have TimB? Direct action is a stinker...we all know it.

**Clanger says:**

11:58am | 21/06/12

james says:

What sort of alternative do we have TimB? Direct action is a stinker...we all know it.

The Alternative is whatever Abbott proposes and how he proposes to pay or it.

I suggest Abbott doesn't have a clue and hence his reluctance to "discuss" what his plans are.

As for TimB. He can be summed up by Coalition good, Labor bad. That's about the extent of it.

**ian 2 says:**

12:21pm | 21/06/12

James old son direct action here in Australia cleans the air we breath and also reduces co2 levels in the World. carbon tax will clean the air we breath but in doing so will drive the heavy polluting industry overseas to countrys with even less pollution control that we have in place now. and will therefore cause the overall co2 levels worldwide to rise. Direct action is by far a better option in my view.

**TimB says:**

12:26pm | 21/06/12

"As for TimB. He can be summed up by Coalition good, Labor bad. That's about the extent of it."

Only if you're a moron who sees everything in black and white and don't read half of my posts.

To break it down simply for a simple mind- I currently support the Coalition yes, but I do not agree with \*everything\* that they say and do.

Comprende?

**james says:**

12:51pm | 21/06/12

Thanks for that great analysis Ian2.

**TimB says:**

01:09pm | 21/06/12

And it seems that my previous post has gone missing. Take 2.

“What sort of alternative do we have TimB? Direct action is a stinker...we all know it. “

That may be James, but the Carbon tax is a bigger stinker. Direct Action won't raise prices across the economy. And if/when the government of the day decides 'You know what, this Direct Action lark just isn't working', they can turn around and end it pretty much the next day. The Carbon tax is nowhere near as flexible.

And the only \*real\* alternative is nuclear power IMO.

### **james says:**

02:33pm | 21/06/12

The only real alternative is a market mechanism without a floor price.

The problem I have with the direct action plan is that it is used to placate the denialists, gives them some hope that it can be canceled, even though both sides have a minimum 5% reduction target.

### **ZSRenn says:**

03:46pm | 21/06/12

@ Berty Here is a challenge for you

Go to these links

<http://www.thepunch.com.au/hot-topics/carbon-tax/>

<http://www.thepunch.com.au/hot-topics/climate-change/>

ctrl F every story, type in Methane and tell me how many times it was mentioned as being part of the tax by any of the authors or commentators.

If it was so obvious why wasn't it included in this discussion before by Julia and her Orwellian Climate Change brigade

It wasn't until they realised they could not raise enough from just taxing CO2.

You are just part of the spin mechanism propping up this the worst government in Australian history.

### **nollamara says:**

05:34pm | 21/06/12

Sleepy renn

Just like you to look for facts on an opinion site like the Punch.

Bet you get your climate change information from watsupwiththat like the rest o the numpties.

Why don't you try looking in obvious places for facts. you can start here.

<http://www.cleanenergyfuture.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/FactSheet-Emissions-from-landfill-facilities.pdf>

### **nollamara says:**

05:34pm | 21/06/12

Sleepy renn

Just like you to look for facts on an opinion site like the Punch.

Bet you get your climate change information from watsupwiththat like the rest of the numpties.

Why don't you try looking in obvious places for facts. you can start here.

<http://www.cleanenergyfuture.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/FactSheet-Emissions-from-landfill-facilities.pdf>

### **ZSRenn says:**

06:34pm | 21/06/12

@ nollamara I asked you to look at nearly 500 pages of debate on the topic asking whether any of the pro Carbon tax commentators or welded on supporters had ever brought the taxation of methane up in discussion before.

Where did I ever state this as facts. I just wondered why the issue has never been raised in more than a year of debate.

You direct me to a government fact sheet in which the first line is "Local governments and other operators may be liable to pay a carbon price for their methane emissions from landfill."

Note the word "may" in there

You have completely missed the point of my question.

I will ask it another way to help you.

When did the word "may" get dropped?

Why hasn't the word "may" been changed in the government fact sheet or an update yet been released.

I suggest that this "may" be because the government has found out that CO2 being taxed is not enough to pay back the already paid payments to the average Joe.

You would think that if was a planned exercise the word "may" would not appear in the fact sheet.

I choose to debate without childish insults!

### **nollamara says:**

06:59pm | 21/06/12

Forming your opinion around others opinions without regard to the actual facts is lazy, especially when the truth is right there in front of you.

What a strange man.

Why don't you tell us to go to wattsupwiththat and form our opinions around all those fact free opinions? Or better yet, give us a link to Bolt and see what he thinks about multiculturalism.

What a simple git.

### **Bertrand says:**

05:49am | 22/06/12

@ZSRenn - thank you for further demonstrating your ignorance.

Methane, also known by its chemical name CH<sub>4</sub>, contains carbon; it is simply another form of carbon based greenhouse gas, albeit one with a much higher greenhouse impact.

### **Pixie says:**

06:53am | 21/06/12

Another nail in Labours coffin. My power is already going to rise by \$15+/- a week, so another \$3? for my rates. Food,? unknown, but will be gouged as business can't hep itself. These are the basics, so clothes? another unknown, telephone, well thats a luxury.

No compensation for us, taxes may come down but....what about all the over paid fat cats to run the new departments needed for this farce? Carbon money going to business, pensioners, dole bludgers, low income earners, the list goes on (as does Julia) I still can't believe some people think this will lower carbon. HOW?

Business can get their money back, government giving them handouts to "Go green" ???

I know, keep business and the Greens happy and fuck the taxpayers/voters

Reply

### **Mack says:**

08:33am | 21/06/12

Labor is blind - to stay in power, they have jumped into bed with the lunatics.....and expect taxpayers to enjoy the journey to the asylum.

<http://www.vexnews.com/2012/06/what-are-they-thinking-this-labor-government-has-done-some-good-but-living-green-is-killing-them/>

### **Knemon says:**

09:04am | 21/06/12

I'm sick of high income earners whinging with their hand out, FFS, is a few dollars a week going to cripple you Pixie? Gimmee gimmee gimmee, whinge whinge whinge, day after day, it never fu\*king stops.

"No compensation for us, taxes may come down"

Not \*may\*, the tax free threshold is going to be tripled, get over it, you will receive something for your tight fistted hand.

### **Frank says:**

09:53am | 21/06/12

Nice try Knemon. The tax free thrshold goes up, but the rate of tax above that threshold goes up as well and the low income and senior Australian tax offsets will be reduced. Overall impact, unless you are earning \$18K or under, bugger all, you'll be in about the same position you are now. As the carbon tax goes up over the coming 3 years, you will most likely be worse off. As far as this scheme goes, it's a clear loser.

**Borderer says:**

11:20am | 21/06/12

Knemon,

If you take money off me for no benefit and admonish me for complaining you are trying to make me feel guilty about being successful. I didn't just wake up this way, I worked hard to be so. Do you feel guilty about being a parasite, knowing that if successful people were like you, you would have to fend for yourself as there would be nobody to leach off? Take your "Struggle" elsewhere, we won ours.

**Knemon says:**

12:33pm | 21/06/12

@ Rosie - "You should do the same, don't get angry"

I will try and follow your kind advice Rosie, I just get so annoyed when people who don't need handouts complain continuously about how hard off they are.

@ Borderer - WTF are you on about?

"Do you feel guilty about being a parasite" - What a pathetic response, you don't know me or my circumstances, the parasites are the non stop whinging middle class welfare recipients who don't need help. I've got good money to say that you would fall into that category and that you would have received more back from the government than I \*ever\* have, but if it makes you feel happy Borderer, keep on whinging about how bad you have it in life, you arrogant sod.

**TimB says:**

02:52pm | 21/06/12

Knemon, your problem is that you characterise people as saying 'gimme gimme gimme'. That's not it. They're NOT asking for handouts. They're just asking for the government to stop TAKING money from them.

Two very different things. And after your spray about the Telegraph yesterday, I would have expected you to be a little more accurate in your statements.

**Borderer says:**

04:35pm | 21/06/12

Knemon

I'm a parasite because the government give me a discount by not using the the public system in health? This as opposed to someone who contributes zero to the economy and lives entirely on what people like me pay to the government, you seem to have it backwards there.

You've done your money too pal, I paid more in tax, last year alone than I got in money from the government over my lifetime.

It irritates me when champions for social justice like you bang on about welfare for the middle class when our net contributions to the government are so much more than the tiny amount we get back. How we are supposed to be evil and greedy and yet we still are the ones giving the most in 'social' contributions through taxation.

Your childish holier than thou attitude makes smile to think that though the party is deregistered there are still some members carrying on the struggle.

**Knemon says:**

04:49pm | 21/06/12

@ TimB - "They're NOT asking for handouts. They're just asking for the government to stop TAKING money from them"

Pixie said in part "No compensation for us" - That sounds to me like someone who is well paid with their hand out. I will be receiving zip compensation but you don't hear me complaining about it.

As for me not believing anything the Telegraph writes, WTF has that go to do with this?

### **TimB says:**

06:05pm | 21/06/12

"Pixie said in part "No compensation for us" - That sounds to me like someone who is well paid with their hand out."

It sounds like a simple statement of fact to me. Pixie has not actually asked for any compensation there, despite the meaning you've arbitrarily attributed.

"As for me not believing anything the Telegraph writes, WTF has that go to do with this?"

Because of the word-twisting tricks you've just employed. Being deliberately misleading. All the things you condemn the Telegraph for. It's hypocritical.

Should we all automatically disbelieve all of your posts now?

### **Little Joe says:**

07:24pm | 21/06/12

@ Knemon

A lot of worthless comments mate!!!

You don't want to pay tax but you want other Australians to pay tax.

You want subsidies but you don't want other Australians to get subsidies.

You want free education and medical but don't want to contribute.

You want to support a 'worthless climate change policy' as long as your lifestyle is not impacted upon.

While other Australians will push the car all your willing to do in sit in the front seat and lazily drop your foot on the brake.

Thanks for your contribution to our society.

### **PJ says:**

08:34pm | 21/06/12

Carbon tax... Where did this \$3.00 come from? It's 9 percent this year and every year.

Plus the unregulated Utilities obligatory 6 percent rise on top.

From this time last year my electricity will have risen by 22 percent.

Here's another problem. In my business sector, 5 years experience used to get you 120,000 to 140,000 salary per year. Now it's 90,000 to 110,000. As planned wages are dropping. This is a direct result of mass immigration and 457 temporary workers happy to work for less. The problem we all face is the ever escalating cost of living. Someone else's carbon tax hiking up the cost of your carrots.

Swan should print money to bring down that high dollar.

### **StevenK says:**

06:54am | 21/06/12

the last line in the article "they will need time". Howard and Rudd both went to the 2007 election with carbon schemes basaed around an ETS. The political writing was on the wall. Councils and other polluters have had since 2007 to do (or at least start doing) something to reduce carbon emissions.

At that time Abbott is quoted as saying that the best way to price carbon was with a tax. Oh how the attitude changes with political opportunism.

People keep ranting about getting rid of the carbon tax, but do not mention the Abbott alternative. While the current scheme is a "tax" paid to the Govt by the polluters, Abbott's scheme is to give away taxpayer money from the budget to the polluters.

This is base reason why no-one has done much to reduce their emissions. Instead of spending their money on reducing emissions they are waiting to get their grubby hands on taxpayer money from Abbott.

Reply

### **Denny says:**

08:37am | 21/06/12

Howards scheme was ALWAYS dependent on the rest of the world. No matter what lies Gillard and Combet (and Farr) tell



us about China, and Europe, we are doing this alone.

We are fools and anyone who supports this tax is a fool.

Our tax will raise the same in 6 months as what the EU will raise in 5 years. The US will not introduce one until 2017/18 at the earliest. (No president would ever introduce a tax that he expressly ruled out prior to an election. It's only our dishonest PM who is brazen enough to do that)

The most disturbing aspect of all this tripe is that the predicted warming has not happened since 1998. Satellite recordings of temperatures prove this. Yet CO2 emissions have continued to rise. The hypothesis has been disproved, yet the zealots cling on.

How foolish, or should I say how much more foolish is Australia going to look when the whole AWG scam comes crashing down? Every day more and more scientists are disagreeing with it. Warmers like James Lovelock (the father of the Gaia theory) have found that the evidence does not support the theory

The greens and the left do not want honest debate. They want no debate. They are happy with the post-normal science that allows a theory to go untested because it meets their political goals.

### **Achmed says:**

*05:39pm | 21/06/12*

Denny..while you mention planting trees etc you dont mention the fact that Abbott plans to give the polluters taxpayer money. And of course businesses can be trusted hahah..look at how they rorted, stole and ripped off taxpayer in the Pink batts debacle.

But then I figuring you are a Liberal and we all know Liberals would rather give taxpayer money to the multi billioaires than the less fortunate in our country

### **Tony says:**

*06:58am | 21/06/12*

This issue highlights the total stupidity and distorted reasoning behind the so called 'carbon tax'. Mow your lawn and use the clippings to compost your garden where they will rot away in a totally natural process releasing 'carbon pollution' into the atmosphere, and that is 'good'. Take then to the dump where they will rot away in a totally natural process releasing 'carbon pollution' into the atmosphere and that is 'bad' and will be taxed.

What breathtaking stupidity. Of course, the 'carbon pollution' coming from the dump is entirely different to the 'carbon pollution' coming from a suburban garden isn't it?

Furthermore when you consider that all that 'carbon pollution' coming from clippings on garden beds isn't accounted for in emissions targets you realise just what a ridiculous con this whole thing has become.

Reply

### **Rob says:**

*08:10am | 21/06/12*

Considering how much more efficiently a rubbish dump can capture its methane to generate power yes they are different. If a rubbish dump chooses to do that they will see a net financial gain from carbon pricing, if they choose to continue to emit unabated they pay a penalty. That incentivising of clean energy upgrades is the whole point of carbon pricing.

### **Grey says:**

*08:52am | 21/06/12*

If a tree falls in the forest and no one is around to issue carbon credits does it release carbon dioxide?

Agree with Tony - cycling carbon between the atmosphere and the biosphere is part of the natural order of things and should not be taxed - why not tax us for the CO2 we breath out - marathon runners would attract a higher tax, people who knit a lower rate.

What should be taxed is the extraction of fossilised or mineralised carbon and release into the atmosphere.  
Eg coal, gas, oil and lime.

### **James in Brisbane says:**

*10:38am | 21/06/12*

And if councils were more efficient in sorting organics from non-organics and having their residents facilitated to contribute to this, they wouldn't have this problem. Gold Coast Council is years behind the times in garbage collection and recycling, especially in relation to green waste. They only have themselves to blame.

**Grey says:**

01:18pm | 21/06/12

@Bertrand.

You really didn't understand a single word I wrote, did you? It went, whoosh, straight over your head

**Johnny D says:**

05:10pm | 21/06/12

Grey,

The stuff that goes into rubbish dumps tends to be your old tv's and other household waste. The majority of components of these things come from what you have listed. That's why the air we breath and indeed the trees are not taxed.

**Achmed says:**

07:11am | 21/06/12

It shows the pathetic state of Australian politics when the Liberals rely on the mantra "Abbott good - Gillard bad" to get elected instead being out there discussing how their policies are better. Rants such as "big bad tax" are not a policy and yet so many people seem willing to vote for Abbott on just that popularist one liner.

And they rant in favour of electing him yet can't/won't debate the Liberal policy on carbon. They either don't know anything about the policy or are so lazy its easier to just keep up the mantra and then hope his policy is better.

How could anyone could believe that giving businesses taxpayer money is a good thing? How could anyone believe that the money that has to come out of the budget will not increase taxation or cause a reduction is spending on health etc?

Abbott reduced spending on health when he was Health Minister, added the money to the surplus. The health of Australians meant less to him than a surplus.

Reply

**Jimbo75 says:**

09:48am | 21/06/12

Oh Achmed, you keep believing those stories about Abbott fed to you by GetUp.

Abbott reduced hospital funding provided to the States in an effort to make them more efficient, those savings were reinvested into the Health system through schemes that the Commonwealth controls (Medicare, Phaemceuticals, Aged Care).

As to your last sentence. You want to know who places a suplus ahead of the Health of Australians - Julia Gillard. To deliver the surplus health spending in 2012-13 will fall in nominal terms, not just in real terms, but nominal terms.

No budget papers released under the Howard Government ever predicted a nominal reduction in Health spending by the Commonwealth.

Those are the facts, not the propaganda peddled bt GetUp.

**Tator says:**

05:47pm | 21/06/12

Achmed,

Abbott DID NOT reduce spending on public hospitals. What happened is that the rate of growth over the forward estimates was reduced but public hospitals still recieved growth in funding in real terms over the agreement.

<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/contributors/abbotts-billion-dollar-ripoff-the-truth-on-health-funding-20100316-qaq1.html>

for an independant look at the issue

**GK says:**

07:43am | 21/06/12

What no one really understands is that the landfills will collect their "Carbon Tax" when the rubbish is deleivered to the tip but will not pay the tax until the carbon dioxide is released which could be for many years in the future. Thus we have to ask where does the money go in the interim and has the government even thought of this. As the rubbish will not release any CO2 immediately yet the money must be collected when dropped off as this is the only opportunity they will get to collect the tax.

Just shows how inept this government is in implementing any process.

Reply

### **PsychoHyena says:**

09:03am | 21/06/12

@GK your comment hurt my brain. I'm trying to work out if you are ignoring or forgetting the rubbish that already exists in these landfills.

### **Denny says:**

10:05am | 21/06/12

PsychoHyena - that would be placing a retrospective tax on land fills. I dont know if the legislation is that broad that it will capture past events. But we shouldn't let the truth get in the way of labor propaganda.

### **PsychoHyena says:**

11:17am | 21/06/12

@Denny, I'm actually really curious here, because one would assume that the CPS applies to all emissions within the period, if those emissions are being caused by something that happened years ago then they should still be included as they are emissions being produced now. It's how all taxes work, if I get belated income for something I did 10 years ago, it gets taxed at the current rate not the rate 10 years ago.

### **Denny says:**

11:42am | 21/06/12

PsychoHyena - its not how CGT works especially if you receive the actual payment over a number of years like when you sell a business. Tax is paid in the year after the transaction occurred.

It may be that the tip may have altered their approach had they known that in 2012 they were going to be taxed. I really dont know how they could work it. It is probably just one of those things like pink batts that have not been given due consideration.

### **Molly says:**

12:18pm | 21/06/12

I can shed some light here. Councils and other landfill operators predict the amount of waste that will be deposited in landfills in the future and the rate at which they will generate emissions and then increase their prices accordingly. The money is deposited into a special accounts with a caveat on it that it can only be spent to reduce councils carbon liability (ie buying offsets or paying carbon tax). Legacy waste (deposited before 1 July 2012) does not attract the price.

The process is quite complicated and requires alot of guess work. I think there will be alot of bugs to iron out in the future and I think a system smiliar to what they have in New Zealand would be a better option (deposit waste pay carbon tax now on waste, smiliar to the EPA levy).

Not related to this question but many landfills have been looking at putting in gas capture systems, but the price hasnt justified the amount of gas captured. The carbon tax will now make it more affordable for smaller landfills.

### **Ellis says:**

07:44am | 21/06/12

A wealth redistribution scheme with inherent guaranteed waste.

A taxation scheme that was not allowed to be voted on tantamount to taxation without representation.

A foul and disgusting display of big government run rampant.

It will do nothing for the environment and yet the Green-religious zealot types worship at its alter.

The good news is we only have to put up with one year of it.

Reply

### **Shane From Melbourne says:**

08:55am | 21/06/12

Hmm...Let's look at Abbott's maternity leave scheme.

Wealth redistribution from singles and childless couples to middle and upper class families, check.

Tax upon business, check.

Expansion of big government, check.

Social Engineering, check.

No difference between Gillard's stupid schemes and Abbott stupid schemes. In fact no real difference between political parties at all. I'm sure the Liberal Party's Direct Action policy will be a waste on taxpayer and contribute bugger all to reducing carbon emissions. ALP or Liberal Party, all Australians lose

### **Tator says:**

06:11pm | 21/06/12

Shane,

the difference is Abbott took his policy to an election, Gillard didn't as her policy for Climate Change was the citizens convention to work out a consensus before enacting any legislation regarding pricing carbon to be implemented after the following election rather than an unilateral implementation of a price on carbon prior during this current term. Which is Ellis' main gripe.

BTW, Abbott's scheme is fairer for more people than the ALP's current scheme which reduces the income for the 63% of all working women who earn more than the minimum wage and less than the Australian Average wage, and allows 98% of working women to retain their current income rather than reducing the income of 70% of working women to the lowest common denominator of the minimum wage.

### **Ellis says:**

06:39pm | 21/06/12

Oh I agree with you Shane. But unlike you I actually wish to talk about the scheme that can be stopped. When Abbott is in power we can talk about him and his stupid parental leave scheme and the waste of his direct action plan. Just want to point out that he is not the PM even though he is the most prominent politician in Australia and Labor are in his thrall.

Also, unlike you, I can see the perverse sense in wasting 2-3 billion dollars for Green boondoggles rather than 20, 30 or whatever else will be spent by Gillard et al. I can also understand the sense in not pursuing a policy that actually reduces the competitive advantage Australia has by virtue of a cheap energy sector. This is one case where I would rather be half stupid given the choices.

You it seems cannot and would rather be mad and run tangential arguments. That's fine by the way. Amusing, but fine.

### **Joan says:**

07:49am | 21/06/12

'They could capture the gas and turn it into electricity to earn Renewable Energy Certificates which also have financial rewards attached.' Gillard crap Carbon Tax turning Australia into third world nation status collecting bits of power from roofs, windmills, rubbish piles, cesspits/dung holes. - 21 century Gillard power source. - grinding down Australia to third world country status. Gillard on track to ship jobs and coal fueled power to China and other countries come 1st of July while she turns to grinding down Australia setting its wheels to backward. - Her worlds highest Carbon Tax set in stone - ready to sink Australia and Australians. Meanwhile she gets ready to celebrate her overnight knifing of people PM Rudd 23rd June 2010

Reply

### **Elli says:**

08:54am | 21/06/12

Want to know why your power bill is so high now (pre carbon tax) Joan? Because your local power company has had to keep building new infrastructure, especially those ugly high voltage power lines, to supply the ever increasing demand for electricity.

Those "bits of power" collected and used locally significantly reduce the demand on the power grid, and the need for new infrastructure. It's not third world country thinking, it's modern, sustainable thinking.

### **Joan says:**

12:00pm | 21/06/12

Only dills believe renewable energy means - solar panels, wind turbines last forever. In 25 years if not before Gillard multi billion dollar solar panels and wind turbines will be on the blink and Australians left in the dark - with a big bill to replace. Coal fired and uranium fired better value, longer lasting for money. Any one who thinks solar panels or wind turbines won't require maintenance or upgrade are fools. Hard working Australians are hit by Gillard double whammy paying for quality coal fuel power and new age airy fairy solar wind

### **Knemon says:**

01:14pm | 21/06/12

"Only dills believe renewable energy means - solar panels, wind turbines last forever"

Actually Joan - it is dills who think finite resources will last forever.

Come the 1st July, the sun will still be shining and the wind will still be blowing...and forever after!

### **Joan says:**

02:50pm | 21/06/12

Knemon: the human being - has finite existence as has the sun - as earth has a finite existence - just a case of when. In 25 years Gillard billion dollar solar panels and wind turbines will be past their use by date you bet , but any new coal power or uranium power station built today will still function at capacity providing top quality energy come 25 years later. - with plenty of coal and uranium to fuel.

### **Joan says:**

07:50am | 21/06/12

`They could capture the gas and turn it into electricity to earn Renewable Energy Certificates which also have financial rewards attached.` Gillard crap Carbon Tax turning Australia into third world nation status collecting bits of power from roofs, windmills, rubbish piles, cesspits/dung holes. - 21 century Gillard power source. - grinding down Australia to third world country status. Gillard on track to ship jobs and coal fueled power to China and other countries come 1st of July while she turns to grinding down Australia setting its wheels to backward . - Her worlds highest Carbon Tax set in stone - ready to sink Australia and Australians. Meanwhile she gets ready to celebrate her overenight knifing of people PM Rudd 23rd June 2010

Reply

### **Mark C, Sydney says:**

08:18am | 21/06/12

What a lot of waffle. Could make a few dollars off the rubbish you emit Joan.

### **PsychoHyena says:**

09:06am | 21/06/12

WTF? So producing energy from rubbish (which has been suggested in the past) is reducing a country to third world status? You do realise that the process requires some first world tech to achieve right?

### **averagebloke says:**

07:50am | 21/06/12

Ibis = Dump Chicken

Reply

### **L. says:**

08:12am | 21/06/12

Indeed..

There isn't much neck meat, but what there is, is pretty tasty...

### **Joan says:**

07:50am | 21/06/12

`They could capture the gas and turn it into electricity to earn Renewable Energy Certificates which also have financial rewards attached.` Gillard crap Carbon Tax turning Australia into third world nation status collecting bits of power from roofs, windmills, rubbish piles, cesspits/dung holes. - 21 century Gillard power source. - grinding down Australia to third world country status. Gillard on track to ship jobs and coal fueled power to China and other countries come 1st of July while she turns to grinding down Australia setting its wheels to backward . - Her worlds highest Carbon Tax set in stone - ready to sink Australia and Australians. Meanwhile she gets ready to celebrate her overnight knifing of people PM Rudd 23rd June 2010

Reply

### **Knemon says:**

09:15am | 21/06/12

How many times are you going to post this diatribe? Telling the same crap over and over isn't going to make it fact.

"21 century Gillard power source. - grinding down Australia to third world country status"

WTF?

### **Simon Of The Internet says:**

10:30am | 21/06/12

There really needs to be a system on here that reads the post back to the user before they can confirm its submission.

### **james says:**

11:24am | 21/06/12

Dont worry Knemon, good old Joan is from radelaide, nothing much to do there.

### **Mik says:**

08:00am | 21/06/12

With the issue of landfill, bring the concept of reducing pollution back onto the agenda. It, at least, had the advantage of people understanding they could do their little bit. Carbon taxing, on the other hand, appears to be giving the message that the individual, especially those who are being compensated, is just a hopeless, helpless, powerless pawn who must rely on big brother Government and Industry to solve all the problems.

Initially the names of the companies were not even released so that those who wanted to, could not even individually apply their little bit of consumer pressure.

Regardless of whether one believes in natural/ man made/ no warming, the form of delivery of this tax has ingeniously dis-empowered the people.

Reply

### **L. says:**

08:21am | 21/06/12

Lets see...

The Carbon Tax:

You pay the carbon tax on the mining of the raw material (diesel, electricity)

You pay a carbon tax on the porcessing of the raw material (electricity)

You pay a carbon tax on the transport of the finished product (diesel, electricity)

You pay a carbon tax at th epoint of sale for electricity at the shop

If you own a diesel car you pay a carbon tax to get the product home

and now you pay a carbon tax to dispose of the product...

Is that about right..???

Reply

### **Joel B1 says:**

08:29am | 21/06/12

And meanwhile, in the real world.

Professor Fritz Vahrenholt (co-founder of Germany's environmental movement and the director of RWE Innogy, one of Europe's largest renewable energy companies) has quit the IPCC in disgust over it's errors, it's refusal to consider natural mechanisms and it's green bias.

He says "the likely warming pause over the coming decades gives us time to convert our energy supply in a planned and sustainable way, without the massive poverty currently planned " and "we now have time for rational decarbonising. This may be achieved by cost-improved and competitive renewable technologies through higher energy efficiency and by improving the use of conventional fossil energy."

And yes, he's in the pay of big RENEWABLE.

Maybe Gillard should stop writing "I'm fantastic" letters to the EU and take note of how rubbish their carbon schemes are.

Reply

### **Plain Jane says:**

10:49am | 21/06/12

Hardly. Here's a very different view of Vahrenholt:

"Vahrenholt admits he has no expertise in climate science, but apparently his status as "Germany's Top Environmentalist" (a title which Vahrenholt appears to have been awarded just recently by anti-climate think tanks and denialists) and his climate "skepticism" are sufficient for some people to take his climate claims seriously.

In an interview with Der Spiegel, Vahrenholt discusses why he chose to write a book rather than attempting to conduct and publish scientific research.

SPIEGEL: You make concrete statements on how much human activity contributes to climatic events and how much of a role natural factors play. Why don't you publish your prognoses in a professional journal?

Vahrenholt: Because I don't engage in my own climate research. Besides, I don't have a supercomputer in my basement. For the most part, my co-author, geologist Sebastian Lüning, and I merely summarize what scientists have published in professional journals—just as the IPCC does.

However, as we will soon see, the difference between Vahrenholt and the IPCC is that the latter accurately summarizes the body scientific literature, while the former misrepresents his sources and only listens to a few select "skeptical" scientists."

As explained in more detail here

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/fritz-vahrenholt-duped-on-climate-change.html>

Then there's Vahrenholt's own words elsewhere. Quoting from the Telegraph UK:

"Scientists of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are quite certain: by using fossil fuels man is currently destroying the climate and our future. We have one last chance, we are told: quickly renounce modern industrial society – painfully but for a good cause. "

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/9338939/Global-warming-second-thoughts-of-an-environmentalist.html>

That's just his opening para - and both opening statements are false.

Most people would read "quite certain" as a simple statement of total certainty. Not so. Quite misleading.

The IPCC has always been very careful to note the levels of certainty of their estimates and conclusions. Some are more robust than others, and they go to a lot of trouble use consistent terms for levels of certainty and to explain them in a way interested non-technical readers can understand. As he was on the IPCC, Vahrenholt must know that is so.

As for "quickly renounce modern industrial society", well that is simply a falsehood. The IPCC has never said that, nor anything like it. As he was on the IPCC, Vahrenholt must know that isn't so.

Vahrenholt is not a reliable commentator. He's a self-interested spruiker.

I'd rather take the time to digest the range of IPCC work for myself, than place any reliance on this fellow. Here they are, all the way back to 1990

[http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/publications\\_and\\_data\\_reports.shtml](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_and_data_reports.shtml)

Meanwhile, the IMF is in broad agreement with carbon mitigation mechanisms, seeing equal effectiveness of carbon pricing vs emission trading, suggesting a price of about US\$20 by 2020, with compensation to consumers, and saying "Comprehensive Carbon Pricing Policies Can Effectively Reduce Emissions and at Least Cost"

Plenty, plenty more here: <http://www.imf.org/external/Pubs/FT/books/2012/climate/climate.pdf>

<http://www.imf.org/external/np/seminars/eng/2012/rio/pdf/fiscal.pdf>

### **haggis says:**

01:16pm | 21/06/12

@ Plain Jane: The original head of the IPCC was not a climate scientist either. Rajendra K.Pachauri was born in Nainital, India. According to Wikipedia (no attribution to source) He was educated at La Martiniere College in Lucknow and at the Indian Railways Institute of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering in Jamalpur, Bihar. He belongs to the Special Class Railway Apprentices, 1958 Batch, an elite scheme which heralded the beginning of mechanical engineering education in India. He began his career with the Indian Railways at the Diesel Locomotive Works in Varanasi. Pachauri was awarded an MS degree in Industrial Engineering from North Carolina State University, Raleigh, in 1972, as well as a joint Ph.D. in Industrial Engineering and Economics in 1974. He is a strict vegetarian, partly due to his beliefs as a Hindu, and partly because of the impact of meat-production on the environment.

### **L. says:**

01:31pm | 21/06/12

"Hardly. Here's a very different view of Vahrenholt:

"Vahrenholt admits he has no expertise in climate science, but apparently his status as "Germany's Top Environmentalist"

So he is the same as Tim Flannery then..?

### **Denny says:**

02:00pm | 21/06/12

Plain jane - why not attack James Lovelock now. You must hav heard of him. James Ephraim Lovelock, CH, CBE, FRS, Ph.D (born 26 July 1919) is an independent scientist, environmentalist and futurologist. He is best known for proposing the Gaia hypothesis, which postulates that the biosphere is a self-regulating entity with the capacity to keep our planet healthy by controlling the chemical and physical environment.

Like our Tim Flipflop, Lovelock made such predictions as:

"By 2040, parts of the Sahara desert will have moved into middle Europe. We are talking about Paris – as far north as Berlin. In Britain we will escape because of our oceanic position."

"If you take the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predictions, then by 2040 every summer in Europe will be as hot as it was in 2003 – between 110F and 120F. It is not the death of people that is the main problem, it is the fact that the plants can't grow – there will be almost no food grown in Europe."

"We are about to take an evolutionary step and my hope is that the species will emerge stronger. It would be hubris to think humans as they now are God's chosen race."

Sadly for him and most of the warmers the theory does not meet reality. This is what Lovelock said just last year:

"The problem is we don't know what the climate is doing. We thought we knew 20 years ago. That led to some alarmist books – mine included – because it looked clear-cut, but it hasn't happened," Lovelock said... "The world has not warmed up very much since the millennium. Twelve years is a reasonable time ... it (the temperature) has stayed almost constant, whereas it should have been rising - carbon dioxide is rising, no question about that . . . There's nothing much really happening yet. We were supposed to be halfway toward a frying world now,"

Yet we are all expected to keep believing. Most of the scientists dont want the gravy train to stop. They have never seen so much money and when it turns out that this has all been in vain and we find out that CO2 emissions are not warming the earth, the money will stop. Under no circumstances can they allow that to happen.

### The Old Man says:

08:37am | 21/06/12

So if the local council tip emits methane gas that is BAD.?

But if the local council tip collects and burns that methane, producing CO2 that is GOOD?

OK, just wanted to get that right! 😊

Reply

### the magpie says:

10:55am | 21/06/12

A few facts, Methane (CH4) is a greenhouse gas that remains in the atmosphere for between 9-15 years. It is over 20 times more effective in trapping heat in the atmosphere than carbon dioxide (CO2) and is emitted from a variety of natural and human-influenced sources.

Therefore it is better to convert the methane into CO2, whilst generating electricity/heat. So yes it is GOOD

### Gordon says:

11:22am | 21/06/12

Yes. in making energy out of the waste gas, less energy is required from burning of coal or gas. Nett result is less carbon up the chimney for same amount of energy. CO2 is I believe a less-strong greenhouse gas than methane. I'm not a big fan of catatrophic AGW btw, but making good use of waste just seems sensible and why emit more CO2 than we have to?

### Miles says:

01:54pm | 21/06/12

The funny thing is....when did CO2 - a naturally occuring gas that is essential for sustaining plantlife on this planet - be deemed to be 'bad'? This is the real wool that has been pulled over people's eyes...

### Nyani says:

08:39am | 21/06/12

Seems that this vicious circle is spinning faster that ever. Carbon & the issues which are dubious science guessing with computer models.

Agreed there is a change happening on the planet but weather is not the only change for which carbon saturation gets blamed!

There is also seismic change, underground activity that attracts no debate whatsoever.

Is this because there is no computer model to guess the answers?



Why not just make it part & parcel of the carbon fraud?

Better still face the fact of removing all the oil from your engine & running it at high revolutions to see how many miles can be covered.

This has happened to the various continental plates below the earth surface, with the extraction of its natural lubricating slip/slide material the bearings are shot there is no oil to cushion the movement!

Shell BP & Cabal will have silenced all debate on this one !

Reply

### **Bob Stewart, the Elder says:**

*08:42am | 21/06/12*

The council should dig their heels in ( sorry for that one) and just refuse to pay for lies that began with the IPCC lest they be just regarded as another petty thief. . So what can the politicians do? Take the Council to Court? So what ? if the judgement is against the Council just refuse to pay again and again.

Where is it likely to end? The tax will be abandoned if it cannot be collected. Simple really, and there has been a precedent. Eureka

Reply

### **nankypoo says:**

*08:57am | 21/06/12*

I can see councils going for the cheaper option: build smaller tips in YOUR suburban backyard.

Reply

### **Gordon says:**

*04:41pm | 21/06/12*

good point! If a tip has to do 25,000 whatevers to incurr the tax then two smaller ones is less. I see you have greater future in municipal administration!

### **Karen from Qld says:**

*05:22pm | 21/06/12*

If Malcolm Farr is correct in his article then the cost is per site NOT the total emissions from each Local Government area so therefore Council A which has one large tip emitting say 30,000 tonnes will pay the tax but Council B which for arguments sake has three tips each producing 15,000 tonnes per site will not pay the tax.

Another dumb arse policy from a dumb arse Govt.

### **Mickey T says:**

*06:52pm | 21/06/12*

Karen from Qld, you say "If Malcolm Farr is correct in his article"

By asking 'if' you obviously have never read or you have no understanding of the policy or how it works. How then did you arrive at your conclusion of "Another dumb arse policy"?

I would hate to think your opinion is based purely on ideology without doing any actual research into facts and all those annoying type of things? Your opinion deserves better.

### **Christian Real says:**

*06:31am | 22/06/12*

Karen from Qld

It wasn't the smartest thing for Queenslanders to elect an LNP government, who is now sacking working, penny pinching by removing tea, coffee, milk and sugar from workers lunchrooms, and more recently even stooping low to take away free coffee for the doctors and nurses in Queensland's hospital.

The fact that Newman has rushed through legislation to sack, penalise workers from going on strike, shows exactly where Queensland is headed in the near future.

Newman may have a majority in Queensland's State parliament, but he has not got a mandate because he took none of these things to the State election with him.

Absolute power corrupts, and Queensland can no longer be seen as the Smart State, but is fastly becoming the dumb state.

The only dumb arse gov't, is the one that you Karen and others elected for Queensland.

**Tator says:**

08:16am | 22/06/12

Christian Real,

Newman was elected to clean up the mess that the ALP has left from 13 years of screwing the state up, leaving state debt at around \$62 billion and growing - during a mining boom as well. On top of that, the ALP fudged the level of deficit and it looks like blowing out to double the \$4.9 billion stated in the state budget out to \$9.5 billion.

So Newman does have a mandate to fix the budget as quickly as possible, and there are only two ways to do that, either raise taxes or reduce expenditure. BTW removing taxpayer funded coffee, tea and biscuits is just bringing them back in line with the other states, here in SA, both state and federal government employees have had to pay for our own tea, coffee and biscuits since I have been working for the government over the last 23 years

**Karen from Qld says:**

08:43am | 22/06/12

Christian Real yes Qlders like you who kept on electing a Govt that ran this State down to the position where we are in danger of having our credit rating downgraded yet again in spite of being a resource rich state in a mining boom are dumb indeed.

The LNP like all conservative Govts have been left a Labor mess to clean up.

The ones who are going to lose their jobs can thank Beattie and Bligh for their absolute incompetence. Perhaps smiling Pete can say sorry one more time.

One only has to look at the basket case that is Qld Health to see an example of Labor's legacy.. Need I mention the payroll debacle.

And give the Absolute power corrupts thing a rest. In Qld there is no upper House so the Govt of the day has absolute power regardless of how many seats they have.

Labor voters are indeed dumb. BTW whose turn is it to drive the Tarago this week.

**Victor says:**

09:05am | 21/06/12

What scares me is that in about 5-10 years time, you will have a National Party MP who is Minister for Local Government going to the local tip to open an expanded Methane Capture plant that is providing investment to the local council - at the same time the LNP Minister for Trade will be talking about the expanding "Better Australian Futures" [Carbon Tax] scheme as part of a global framework, and the divisions of now will be forgotten after the LNP win in a landslide but keep everything going under a different name.

Reply

**Esteban says:**

12:40pm | 21/06/12

It is a pity the ALP didn't rename the Pacific Solution and leave it in place.

**TimR says:**

09:11am | 21/06/12

Just dump your rubbish in the closest national park. It's free and easy! Plus you provide new materials for our innovative native animals to build new homes with.

Reply

**Dibatag says:**

09:25am | 21/06/12

Dodo has already put up electricity charges we were advised of this last week, God only knows where it will all end, I do know the pensioner bonus-bribe whatever will be gobbled and totally negated , regardless of government B S saying it won't

Reply

**The Real Jacob says:**

03:08pm | 21/06/12

Internet and groceries have gone up significantly compared to last year as well. Rent up too. The carbon tax will be an easy excuse for the blame game.

**Terence says:**

09:29am | 21/06/12

Anywhere there is a Gold Mine! the Government will want to Mine it!

Garbage has become a money making exercise for Governments who don't have enough Gold or Silver mines to plunder, and just think, it's never going to run out of the raw garbage to milk!

Don't for one minute think that this carbon tax is about saving the Planet! It's about filling the tax coffers in Canberra.

Reply

**Shane From Melbourne says:**

10:01am | 21/06/12

Actually it is a rare earths mine. Japan and other countries have made it a high priority to recycle rare earths from landfill due to Chinese export restrictions upon rare earths. Pity most of the e-waste gets dumped in Africa...

**Tommy says:**

09:50am | 21/06/12

I work in the waste recycling industry, In Sydney the price per tonne to send to landfill is at least three times as expensive as it is in Victoria (Due to land shortage), it so so expensive that recycling facilities have been able to set up in Sydney and make a profit because it is financially viable in this state.

The carbon tax WILL increase the cost to send to landfill by 20% in only 4 years, and thats only rubbish. Good for waste recycling facilities and maybe good for the environment, bad for the consumer if industry doesnt adapt.

Reply

**Alan says:**

09:56am | 21/06/12

Say you have a big landfill site, and you produce more than 25,000 tonnes of methane a year. Lets say - 30,000 tonnes. Will you pay the tax? OR - will you split into two subsidiaries? Stick a fence down the middle of your landfill, and now you are TWO companies generating 15,000 tonnes each. With all the paperwork, it may even be cheaper.

Reply

**iansand says:**

09:57am | 21/06/12

So the carbon price is an incentive for operators of landfill to collect emissions and use those emissions to generate

electricity, thus entitling the operators to carbon credits as well as earning extra income from the sale of electricity. Looks to me as though that is exactly what a carbon price is intended to achieve. A win coming and going.

Reply

**L. says:**

*11:15am | 21/06/12*

"Looks to me as though that is exactly what a carbon price is intended to achieve. A win coming and going."

Buring methane now and emitting even MORE CO2 as opposed to letting the methane escape over time is a win..??

Umm...doesn't that defeat the point of the carbon tax..??

**L. says:**

*11:15am | 21/06/12*

"Looks to me as though that is exactly what a carbon price is intended to achieve. A win coming and going."

Buring methane now and emitting even MORE CO2 as opposed to letting the methane escape over time is a win..??

Umm...doesn't that defeat the point of the carbon tax..??

**year of the dragon says:**

*11:29am | 21/06/12*

Spot on iansand.

Except the technology to collect the emissions and generate electricity isn't viable.

So, basically, the tax doesn't reduce carbon emissions and carbon emissions can't be collected because it is not commercially viable.

A loss no matter which way you look at it.

**iansand says:**

*12:16pm | 21/06/12*

I hate to tell you this, L, but methane is a far more potent greenhouse gas than CO2.

yotg - Then why are there several operating plants collecting methane from dumps and converting it to electricity? It is happening in Newcastle <http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2009/09/15/2686457.htm> and in many other places [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biogas#Development\\_around\\_the\\_world](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biogas#Development_around_the_world)

I wish you deniers would at least make an effort to try to understand.

**L. says:**

*01:21pm | 21/06/12*

"I hate to tell you this, L, but methane is a far more potent greenhouse gas than CO2."

Which is still a fraction of a bees dick compared to water vapour and natural methane fissures under the sea.. so what your point?

**iansand says:**

*02:08pm | 21/06/12*

I thought my point was obvious. Methane is a greenhouse gas. Biogeneration deals with the methane and produces energy. This is a good thing.

Now. What's your point?

**Bob of Perth says:**

*10:15am | 21/06/12*

@ L Says - You forgot one extra cost that no one ever raises and that is that GST will apply to the new cost thus another increase on the price of every item after July 1

Reply

**L. says:**

11:31am | 21/06/12

Good point Bob..

### **Bob of Perth says:**

10:15am | 21/06/12

@ L Says - You forgot one extra cost that no one ever raises and that is that GST will apply to the new cost thus another increase on the price of every item after July 1

Reply

### **Holly says:**

10:29am | 21/06/12

Joel B1 - the system he is proposing sounds like the system we are about to get. Congratulations to our forward thinking, brave current government and PM.

Seriously, many councils did not sit on their hands waiting for the carbon price to come along, and took these initiatives such as methane capture years ago when the technology first became available. It was in the interests of the ratepayers to abate the ongoing running costs of the tipsites as well as the emissions they produce. Of course the ratepayers have to elect progressive thinking people to council in the first place instead of conservative naysayers. Why are you people all so afraid to embrace change and so willing to stay petrified (in all senses of the word) while the rest of the world marches on. Please don't run out the furphy of Australia going out on its own - it is so obviously untrue. Just look at what is really happening - the information is there for all of you to read so what happens when you read it - does it just not register as fact? Can you really only deal with three words of one syllable from Tony Abbott - "Carbon Tax Bad". What sad closed lives you lead when Australia is poised at such an exciting place for the future. You all make The Punch such a depressing negative place to visit, so thought I'd brighten your day everyone.

Reply

### **Mack says:**

03:52pm | 21/06/12

"What sad closed lives you lead when Australia is poised at such an exciting place for the future."

And where is that place, Holly? Heading towards the plughole, about to go down the gurgler.

Sure, the sky won't fall ON 1st July, but slowly, slowly, Australian worker's wages are being gobbled up by increasing electricity prices, gas prices, food prices, fuel prices. So where is it going to stop? When all of us have lost our jobs - will that make you tree-huggers happy? Do we then all sit in our humpies singing kumbya, waiting for Gillard's handouts?

### **Andy Mack says:**

05:46pm | 21/06/12

Holly, I'm glad that you're a vibrant person but you should be enthusiastic about promoting the truth, not lies:

<http://www.stop-global-government.org/carbon-dioxide-driven-climate-change-is-a-fraud.htm>

You have been manipulated by very sophisticated and very evil people, Holly, and it's nothing to be ashamed of. They have taken advantage of your good-naturedness. But if you keep promoting their lies, you become an accomplice sooner or later and that is definitely something to be ashamed of.

### **Bertrand says:**

06:17pm | 21/06/12

Well someone here is being manipulated.

### **Brad says:**

10:47am | 21/06/12

Carbon Dioxide is plant food.

I would like to know after we pay the EIGHT Billion TAX. By how much has the planet cooled?? Can it be measured? Why are we selling our coal to China if it is such a poisonousness product.

Lets set up a giant meth lab and sell 'ice' to China as well. Why is petrol exempt?

Small business owners are going to be put under more pressure with rising electricity prices.

Don't pay the tax, wait until 30 November 2013 when Australia will once again have sensible Government.

Reply

**harry says:***11:00am | 21/06/12*

Why should landfills pay a carbon tax? This is rotting biomass, not fossil fuels. There is no net increase in CO2 whether the biomass rots in a forest or a field or as compost in your garden versus it rotting in a landfill.

The same applies for Aluminium, Alcoa has to pay the Carbon tax (#18 in the government's list) despite it buying electricity from generators who are already paying the tax. This is a double tax.

Unless you are directly burning fossil fuels you shouldn't have to pay the tax.

Reply

**Tator says:***06:37pm | 21/06/12*

Harry,

from memory, the reason Alcoa has to pay the tax is that the chemical process that is involved in smelting aluminium releases carbon dioxide. Using the Hall-Héroult process. Alumina, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, is dissolved in an industrial carbon-lined vat of molten cryolite, Na<sub>3</sub>AlF<sub>6</sub> (sodium hexafluoroaluminate), called a "cell". Aluminium oxide has a melting point of over 2,000 °C (3,630 °F) while pure cryolite has a melting point of 1,012 °C (1,854 °F). With a small percentage of alumina dissolved in it, cryolite has a melting point of about 1,000 °C (1,830 °F). Some aluminium fluoride, AlF<sub>3</sub> is also added into the process to reduce the melting point of the cryolite-alumina mixture.

The molten mixture of cryolite, alumina, aluminium fluoride is then electrolyzed by passing a direct electric current through it. The electrochemical reaction causes liquid aluminium metal to be deposited at the cathode as a precipitate, while the oxygen from the alumina combines with carbon from the anode to produce carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub>.

Also Steel makers have to pay the carbon tax as the steel production process also produces CO<sub>2</sub> as a byproduct from the blast furnaces.

**Gordon says:***11:04am | 21/06/12*

25,000 tonnes a year of methane is a commercial quantity of gas. Equivalent in output to say 10 CBM wells, with an energy content worth 2-3 million dollars a year. Technology exists to capture and use this otherwise wasted gas for power generation. It would not be a huge profit after costs but it would pay the carbon tax and a bit left over. Any council sitting on 1,350,000 GJ pa and not doing this already should be wondering why not.

Reply

**Esteban says:***12:31pm | 21/06/12*

Hang on Gordon building the infrastructure to capture it would probably require federal funding and that sounds like direct action which we can't have.

You are of course quite right Gordon. If you come up with an alternative that is cheaper or more efficient the debate on whether is required to prevent global warming becomes irrelevant.

If we developed solar technology that was cheaper than coal the debate about the science of climate change is irrelevant.

There were quite a few sceptics about the impact of CFC on ozone but it became irrelevant because the alternative technology was superior. Even if they could no one would go back to CFC.

Methane, CO<sub>2</sub> whatever are only a problem if you can't find a purpose for them.

Check out the blue economy. It has it all over the green economy.

**chase77 says:***11:11am | 21/06/12*

I'm no greenie, but when are you people going to realise we are stuffing up this earth. We are too concerned with keeping up with the Jones's. If we all bit the bullet and each reduced our carbon footprint, then we may have a chance. Alas, no one wants to give up even a little bit. There's no real difference between Baby Boomers Gen X & Y. Should all be called Gen

Greedy

Reply

### **sunycoastman says:**

11:26am | 21/06/12

Good, bad or indifferent, who cares. The fact of the matter is that the Welsh Witch stated she wouldn't be introducing a carbon tax and that was enough to put her in a position where she could negotiate for government. Everything else associated is irrelevant as far as I'm concerned!

Reply

### **Aussie Wazza says:**

11:30am | 21/06/12

I read PUNCH every day and most of the comments. Where I think my opinion is relevant, I comment.

The main point though, is that so many of the comments are politically motivated and biased. No matter what the subject, it can be blamed on whichever party the contributor has his knife into.

This one, the carbon tax is just that, with opinions flying from both sides giving the 'facts'.

But what are the facts and what motivated the action? What are the short and long term reasons?

'I hate mummy because she made me take that yucky medicine.' 'I love mummy because she lets me drink Coca cola.'

What are the facts? What will the tax do that is beneficial? What are the alternatives? What happens if it isn't implemented?

Surely, no government whose only real motivation for any action is to be the top dog is going to do anything that will lose it votes, no matter what other consequence. So why is Gillard so keen on this tax?

I would like to see a true fact sheet giving ALL the reasons and options.

Then I will put in my two bobs worth at the polling booth..

Reply

### **sunnycoastman says:**

12:22pm | 21/06/12

A good point Aussie Wazza, that information must be out there somewhere, but when I look it's total confusion and contradiction.

However, I go back to my point above. It's all irrelevant given the circumstances in which the situation arose.

### **Economist says:**

12:55pm | 21/06/12

@AW Well Betrand has tried to summarise the aims within the economic framework.

The point from a pure economists point of view is that taxes are undesirable because they distort the market. But some taxes create a bigger distortion than others and the Carbon tax/price is one of these horrifying types of tax. Like taxes on gambling, cigarettes and alcohol. Here is a good summary from a purist economist focusing on the average excess burden.

[http://blogs.theaustralian.news.com.au/henryergas/index.php/theaustralian/comments/carbon\\_impost\\_a\\_recipe\\_for\\_low\\_wages/](http://blogs.theaustralian.news.com.au/henryergas/index.php/theaustralian/comments/carbon_impost_a_recipe_for_low_wages/)

The issue is do we want to change behaviour and enact a Pigovian tax.  
<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/pigoviantax.asp#axzz1yOLu3GDs>

So the tax certainly reduces the level of economic activity that otherwise would have been generated, but the issue is whether the benefits from the tax, the potential change in behaviour i.e. we consume less, and the revenues from the tax being invested in alternatives, leads to better outcomes.

Personally I've come around to being ambivalent about the situation. Either we change our behaviour now, at a cost, or we adapt and pay in the future, at a cost. Either way the burning of fossil fuels has an impact on our environment whether you believe in Co2 climate change or not. I do and despite what others have claimed so does James Lovelock. His opinion is that Co2 is impacting on climate but we have more time than he previously argued.

From my POV we are finally charging industry for the negative externalities they've imposed on society, which they'll more than likely pass onto us, but why shouldn't we pay. Whereas the direct funding model doesn't create the same incentives to change behaviour, but will still require taxes to pay for it either through higher existing taxes, rather than a new tax or significant budget cuts in other areas of expenditure.

### **Knemon says:**

01:02pm | 21/06/12

"Surely, no government whose only real motivation for any action is to be the top dog is going to do anything that will loose it votes, no matter what other consequence. So why is Gillard so keen on this tax?"

That comment alone proves to me that Gillard is doing this because she believes it is the right thing to do, not for her but for the country, that doesn't mean I agree with her, nor am I saying it is the right thing to do, but surely it shows that this is not just about ego and power at all costs, anyone with that mindset would have told The Greens where to go (they were never going to back the LNP) and sucked up to the people to win votes, instead, Gillard took the hard road and made the very unpopular hard decisions, something, good tough leaders do well.

### **Rebes says:**

01:14pm | 21/06/12

So true. Wouldn't it be good if news.com could give its readers two carbon pricing schematics - one being Labors and other being the LNPs (Direct Action Plan). Something visual so we could see how each scheme works and then we could make up our own minds.

I agree, if Gillard is so hell bent on doing anything to stay in the job as claimed by many, why then has she introduced an unpopular tax?

### **Andy Mack says:**

03:28pm | 21/06/12

This is the reason:

<http://www.stop-global-government.org/carbon-dioxide-driven-climate-change-is-a-fraud.htm>

### **Andy Mack says:**

03:34pm | 21/06/12

Knemon, that doesn't prove anything.

Julia Gillard is being paid off by (ie. bribed) by the global elite to introduce a carbon dioxide tax to Australia.

If you understand this simple truth, then I salute you. If you are too sophisticated to understand this simple truth, then I truly pity you.

### **sweden 2 france 0 says:**

12:13pm | 21/06/12

rubbish dumps are only garbage dumps.

recycle more and reduce the garbage.

Reply

### **england 1 ukraine 0 says:**

12:15pm | 21/06/12

what rubbish can you bet on ?

T ony

A bbott

B ulldust

Reply

### **stephen says:**

08:58pm | 21/06/12

That's not quite true, cynthia.

Abbott would not bulldust, because he is not personable enough to deceive,( as a matter of 'to fool') - which is really a Labor trait, and to which the sensitive and smart must remain on alert - and that is why the Left is smart : we have to be on the lookout for fakes because if we were to trust the Right, then we would have to go looking, (and not defending) the guilty and as anyone knows, when we are relegated by the working poor in their garb, they may be, in fact, only poor.

### **Paul says:**

12:37pm | 21/06/12



Are we complaining over an extra 13c a week?

Reply

**PhoenixGirl says:**

*12:49pm | 21/06/12*

I am glad that NSW are going to be detailing on each electricity bill the carbon tax dollar amount.

I will be paying my bill minus the carbon tax, we can go to court and I will request irrefutable evidence of the reason for this fraudulent tax. If there is irrefutable evidence I will pay, if there is not then this I will not be defrauded.

I will also send my carbon tax bills to Julia, she said we were never going to have it so she can pay it for me.

Reply

**sunnycoastman says:**

*01:08pm | 21/06/12*

Good idea, although I suspect you'll lose in the end, but good you're keen to make a stand, the more the merrier.

However, I want to know where my household assistance is, I don't seem to be getting any, even though the government gives the impression that we ALL are! And that's bullshit, not 'bulldust' football fan above.

Paul. If you're naive enough to think it'll cost you just 13c a week then there's little hope for you.

**Knemon says:**

*03:36pm | 21/06/12*

Your bill PhoenixGirl or mummy and daddy's bill?

**Blind Freddy says:**

*03:58pm | 21/06/12*

I'm betting you don't. But, if you do make sure that you return any compensation money that might come your way.

P.S. Are you happy that all of your other taxes are achieving their intended goals. We pay taxes for police but we still have crime, we pay taxes for education but we still have half-wits etc. etc.

**Karen from Qld says:**

*01:36pm | 21/06/12*

So the answer for Councils is to have more smaller tips rather than one large one. Just to go to show how stupid this whole thing really is. The same amount of methane will be emitted. It will just come from more tips and no revenue for the Federal Govt. BTW included in those 33 councils affected are the Councils of Tamworth and Port Macquarie.. Very interesting indeed.

Reply

**JT says:**

*01:41pm | 21/06/12*

I have an idea capture the methane that comes out of Canberra. That should be enough to power the entire country and we won't need a carbon tax and Julia really will be the one solving all of Australia's supposed global warming issues.

Reply

**Stinky Pete says:**

*01:53pm | 21/06/12*

I'm putting my prices up now because if I wait until the tax is in people might think I'm gouging on the Carbon Tax. I can't say it's due to the carbon tax because the carbon cops will fine me \$1.3M & I then have to prove that it is due to the tax?

Reply

**Andy Mack says:**

*03:17pm | 21/06/12*

I am so angry about the fraud of carbon dioxide-driven climate change that I have to be careful not to say something which could be used against me at a later time. All I am going to say is that the defeat of Labor at the next Federal election will be worse than the defeat of Labor at the last Queensland election and the following people will all lose their seats:

- > Gillard
- > Swan
- > Albanese
- > Conroy
- > Wong
- > Combet

I wonder if Gillard and Swan are already being paid off by outside sources for implementing a carbon dioxide tax. I wonder if they already have funds sitting in Swiss bank accounts as compensation for their efforts to date. This is how the global elite, who are pushing this fraud of carbon dioxide-driven climate change, play the game. They bribe politicians.

It is ABSOLUTELY certain that when Gillard and Swan both lose their seats at the next election, that they will BOTH say, "I'm resigning from politics". In other words, "So high was my commitment to improving Australia, that now that I've been successful in implementing a carbon dioxide tax to destroy the country, I'm out of here". In other words, "So long, suckers".

Reply

### **Knemon says:**

*04:12pm | 21/06/12*

You're certainly no psephologist Andy Mack.

Conroy and Wong are both senators. Conroy is not up for re-election until 2016.

A better understanding of how our parliamentary system operates might help you in the future.

Cheers

### **Andy Mack says:**

*05:24pm | 21/06/12*

Wow, Knemon, I'm so impressed that you've managed to keep your post all polite, when what you really mean is, "Andy Mack, you are a moron". This is an amazing achievement of disingenuousness on your part.

But thanks for educating me. I actually think that what you've pointed out is highly irrelevant, just like the way our parliamentary system operates is highly irrelevant to the welfare of Australia, which is why I am not the slightest bit interested in gaining a better understanding of how it works. It's a broken unit.

### **Tbird says:**

*05:40pm | 21/06/12*

Andy Mack, I live in Julia's electoral area and unfortunately she wont be voted out any time soon. Voters here love her..... I was at the local doctors the other day waiting and new bulletin appeared on the TV in waiting area.....the old dears turned up the volume and were completely smitten with "Our Julia". I vomitted in my mouth a little. No wonder doctor thought I looked pale at the time. I felt dirty.....and disguised.

### **Karen from Qld says:**

*03:19pm | 21/06/12*

Perhaps the voters of New England are going "cold" on Tony Windsor.. The "stench" from the Carbon Tax is beginning to get up their noses.

<http://www.northerndailyleader.com.au/news/local/news/general/new-england-poll-favours-torbay/2597992.aspx?src=rss>

Reply

### **mikem says:**

*04:17pm | 21/06/12*

When the next election happens the Carbon (Pollution) Tax will have been in place for 15 months so we will know what is fact and what is fiction in relation to its impacts.

Reply

### **Unions Rock says:**

*07:06pm | 21/06/12*

I'll preface my comment by stating I do not believe in any carbon tax or carbon plan.

People keep commenting that once the election is held and Abbott wins power the carbon tax is gone. If only that were true.

Abbott has a carbon plan based around giving taxpayer money to the polluters. That is probably based on his Christian value that it is better to give than receive. Because I cannot see any other reason for anyone to believe that giving big business our money is better than having the polluters pay the Govt.

So Abbott gets elected. Stops the carbon tax. How does he ensure that the price rises attributed to the carbon tax are removed? Now now, I know that electricity bills are going to show the CT component. But what about the retail chains like Woolies, coles, David Jones etc? How is he going to distinguish between normal business operation increases and those claimed to be a result of the CT?

When he repeals the legislation and the tax cuts are removed and the compensation payments are stopped, will that happen before or after the prices are adjusted downwards? Because the companies (polluters) are no longer paying the CT.

Ranting that Gillard and the tax should go, and that Abbott will repeal the tax, the voting part is the easy bit. The rest ain't so easy.

How much will Abbott increase taxation so he will have money to give the polluters? So while prices may go down with the removal of the CT, we will be paying more tax.

The reality is - no matter which carbon reduction plan we have, the only choice we really have is which one going to be in your wallet - Gillard or Abbott. Because no matter which way you cut it, the people (taxpayer) always pay

Reply

### **Mark/Fox says:**

*07:46pm | 21/06/12*

Hmm carbon tax and rubbish tips, sounds like an overpopulation problem again, but when you have a foolish Govt running our country what do you expect a quality lifestyle and a healthy environment, won't happen as we have gone past the sustainable level already.

Reply

### **Rebes says:**

*11:10pm | 21/06/12*

So you're blaming Labor for over population? I think we have Costello's baby bonus to thank for that...

### **Bho Ghan-Pryde says:**

*12:17am | 22/06/12*

In all probability the only lasting legacy of this carbon tax will be Tony Abbott as PM.

Reply

### **Pixie says:**

*07:43am | 22/06/12*

Knemon 9-04 21st,

I have OH's tax return in my hand from last year, you think \$41,000-00 is high income? I don't work away from home and he puts in 10 hour days 7 days a week, unless it rains or his machinery breaks down. But he is doing what he knows and loves. Due to circumstance he is not well educated.

So tell me again about us high income whingers!!!!

I do care if we don't get the bribe from Gillard's lot, I just don't think this whole carbon rort is going to make a lick of difference except make life more expensive and complicated.

As for tight fisted, we watch what we spend, own everything we have outright, including our home and plant machinery. May as well go on the dole and get all the lurks the dole bludgers get.

Reply