

**Reply by Tim Farron MP to emails by his constituents Henry Adams and Gwen Harrison re:
EDM 240: TAR SANDS AND THE FUEL QUALITY DIRECTIVE**

<http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2013-14/240>

Dr. T. Henry Adams
55 Hayclose Crescent
KENDAL, CUMBRIA
LA9 7NT

Our Ref: Adam032/21/ag

21 June 2013

Dear Henry

Thank you very much for your recent email with regard to the essential need to constrain the market for oil that is produced from tar sands and thanks for your expert analysis that underpins this case.

You are quite right that I share your concerns about such developments and I am pleased to confirm that I have signed EDM 240 to give my full support to the Motion: -

That this House notes that oil from tar sands produces on average 23 per cent more carbon emissions than conventional fuels from extraction to consumption, according to peer reviewed scientific analysis from Stanford University; further notes that tar sands exploitation causes severe local environmental harm including deforestation and pollution, which threatens the lives and livelihoods of indigenous communities; supports the EU's modest aim of reducing emissions from transport fuels by six per cent by 2020 through the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD); considers accurate labelling in the FQD of oil from unconventional fuels as more carbon-intensive than conventional oil to be a sensible measure; believes that this labelling would discourage the import of unconventional fuels such as tar sands oil into Europe and contribute to the shift to cleaner fuels; further notes that the exploitation of unconventional fossil fuels is incompatible with the achievement of the UK Government's repeated commitment to keep global warming below a two degree increase and thus to avoid catastrophic climate change; is concerned at the intensive lobbying against accurate labelling of unconventional fuels in the FQD from the Canadian government and British oil companies with tar sands interests such as Shell and BP; and urges the Government to support proposals for separate default values for unconventional fuels, including oil shale and tar sands, during negotiations and in the vote in the EU Council of Ministers later this year.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

TIM FARRON MP

From: Henry Adams [mailto:henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com]

Sent: 14 June 2013 02:02

To: Tim Farron

Cc: Gwen Harrison

Subject: EDM 240: Tar sands and the Fuel Quality Directive

Importance: High

This version with a correction – for shale gas I meant shale oil

Dear Tim – as you requested: (but just a draft email tonight in case my condition is worse tomorrow morning).

Re EDM 240: TAR SANDS AND THE FUEL QUALITY DIRECTIVE <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2013-14/240>

Gwen has written a very concise and to-the-point summary of why we urgently need an effective FQD that recognizes the scientific reality of fuel from tar sands being of significantly higher life-cycle emissions than fuel from conventional sources. (I've appended her email.) Also - the newly tabled EDM is very self explanatory. So I won't repeat these here but instead expand from them.

We are now rapidly approaching a last chance major decision point whereby we can use an effective FQD to send a strong signal to Obama to say NO to the remaining section of the Keystone XL pipeline and strangle output from the tar sands from reaching the sea in signif volume. Obama is delaying the decision as long as possible, but may not be able to do so longer than maybe early autumn (?? – hard to tell for certain).

The tar sands industry is now facing financial difficulties – just at a time when it's wanting to accelerate into a proposed insane **3 times expansion**. This is because 1. it is land-locked, 2. facing competition with US shale oil, and so 3. its accumulating products are having to be sold at below profit price! So it and Harper are desperate for it to get outlet to sea with the last leg of KXL pipeline, to reach markets including Europe (eg via Valero's terminal at Pembroke refinery; Valero will receive the biggest flow of dilbit from the KXL & will badly pollute nearby housing estates in refining it for export). Otherwise investors will be backing off or even trying to get out (they are already at least holding back!).

But Norman Baker has deliberately ignored this urgency and opportunity, and has been continuing to parrot Harper gov lies.

Last year he at least abstained from voting on the FQD, and we had a last ditch hope he might see sense. But this year when asked by EU to state UK preference re the FQD prior to the forthcoming Member states meeting on this (later this year) he selected for the FQD to regard fuel from tar sands as **not** having any higher emissions value than that for fuel from conventional sources – which is just the lie that the Conservative Harper & Alberta govs & the industry want – so they can be assured of an open EU market and the signal they want to Obama. So Baker has now slithered fully over to the evil Harper side.

It's unclear whether Shell's "Contact Minister for Shell" (Vince Cable) pressured Norman to conform to the letter he received from Shell to weaken the FQD (I've a copy of this somewhere).

I am attaching: – in chrono order from c.Feb/march 2013:

1. A link to '[Carbon Bomb or Carbon Bubble](http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/CarbonBombOrCarbonBubble.pdf)' - a draft article I wrote for SLACC which expands on the above up to c.Feb. 2013 – but lacks Baker's recent preference decision I've stated above.

<http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/CarbonBombOrCarbonBubble.pdf>

2. 1may13: Inspirational article by one of my UKTSN (UK Tar Sands Network)contacts **Emily Coats** in London Uni.'s Extreme Energy Initiative website: 'Creating a future we want: **How Europe can stop tar sands expansion**' <http://extremeenergy.org/2013/05/01/creating-a-future-we-want-how-europe-can-stop-tar-sands-expansion/> – similar to my 1. but better in some ways.

3. **Norman Baker's** recent preference decision: UK signals support for EU import of Canadian tar sands oil Environment guardian.co.uk 15may13 John

Vidal [http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/may/15/uk-signals-support-eu-](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/may/15/uk-signals-support-eu-import-tar-sands)

[import-tar-sands](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/may/15/uk-signals-support-eu-import-tar-sands) 'Leaked papers show UK rejects proposal to classify oil from tar sands as highly polluting, a label that would deter EU countries from importing it' ... 'But of six options put to EU countries in April on how to implement the proposal, the UK chose the two that would make no differentiation between the carbon content of fuels. "Based on the findings so far, it seems clear that [these two] seem to meet the policy aims of the directive with the least risks of unexpected consequences," the UK said in the documents. It firmly rejected others that allowed a difference.' Charlie Kronick & Norman Baker both quoted. Baker says no change in his stance from before

4. **Hot off the press:** UKTSN's write-up for this Thursday:

Stop Harper! Canadian PM met by multiple tar sands protests in London No Tar Sands UK Tar Sands Network: 13jun13

<http://www.no-tar-sands.org/2013/06/stop-harper-canadian-pm-met-by-multiple-tar-sands-protests-in-london/>

5. **Near to press:** A draft of a report/letter I've written to Nick Clegg to honour his pledge re human rights – in respect to the Canadian First Nations impacted by the tar sands industry and Harper's evil removal of their rights:

<http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/LetterToNickCleggReHumanRightsOfCanadaFirstNations.pdf>

As it is long – I will be writing a short summary letter that refers to the report/letter when I get time. It will be widely distributed and hopefully published.

Finally – for reference:

6. **My tar sands website:** this is a huge resource with a summary at top of page – but is sketchy on recent news due to my time spent on 2030decarb and fracking. For recent news it links to UKTSN website etc. <http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com>. Your researchers/assistants may find it a useful reference – together with UKTSN website and Price of Oil website – to which mine links.

Please rally as much support as you can from your LibDem MP colleagues to support this EDM and when you get enough support – maybe a Parl vote?

Best of luck! - Henry

Must try and get some sleep now.

PS: my briefing piece that **demolishes Norman Baker statements** a year ago (but he's still peddling the same or v similar line):

On 20jan12 (still very relevant a year on) I uploaded a [pdf of my criticism of Norman Baker's words re the FQD](#): It comments on DfT Minister Norman Baker's 2dec11 piece on the Fuel Quality Directive in Liberal Democrat Voice. I had emailed this in December 2011 to Tim Farron MP (& copied to Simon Hughes MP).

Dr T.H.L. Adams - Consultant Ecologist
henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com

www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html – my website's 'hub' page NB: read up re **FRACKING**

www.dragonfly1.plus.com – re Tar Sands

www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK

www.facebook.com/henry.adams.56

Kendal home: 01539 722158 Mobile: *out of action temporarily*

55 Hayclose Crescent, Kendal, Cumbria LA9 7NT

From: Gwen Harrison

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 9:09 PM

To: [Tim Farron MP](#)

Cc: [Henry Adams](#)

Subject: Tar sands EDM

Dear Tim.

I notice Caroline Lucas has just tabled an EDM on Tar sands and the Fuel Quality Directive (see: <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2013-14/240>).

It's absolutely critical that the market for tar sands oil be stemmed in order to reduce the rate of extraction, and therefore the impact on both climate change and the local environment in Canada. Including separate default values for unconventional fuels in the Fuel Quality Directive (as the EDM urges) would go a long way to achieving this.

Based on your excellent track record on climate change matters, I believe this is an EDM you would be keen to support. I would be very grateful if you could confirm whether or not you will be adding your name to the list of signatories.

Kind regards,
Gwen Harrison