



MEMORANDUM

January 1, 2023

To: The citizens of the G7 countries

Attention: Mr. Joe Biden, President, United States of America.

Mr. Fumio Kishida, Prime Minister of Japan.

Mr. Olaf Scholtz, Chancellor of Germany.

Mr. Rishi Sunak, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Emmanuel Macron, President of France.

Mrs. Giorgia Meloni, Prime Minister of Italy.

Mr. Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada.

Subject: **THE ATMOSPHERIC CLIMATE TESTING SIMULATOR**

A permanent resolution to the CO2 theory of climate change.

Dear Sirs/Madam:

Exactly one year ago today, I published my proposal regarding the above subject, details of which can be found at www.dextras.com/climate.html . I realize that all of you are not scientifically trained to any great degree but I would still invite you to have a brief look at same. It's not very long (three pages and a single concept drawing) and judging by the response I have received so far, you will be pleasantly surprised at how straight forward this whole climate change business actually is. I also understand your general requirement to consult the "experts" and I welcome any comment or suggestions they may have. I would suggest that you select the best physics engineer you can find in your respective countries and ask him or her to review it, come to their own independent conclusion and get them to put same in writing, directly to you. This will help crystallize the issue in precisely the same way that Einstein's letter (to FDR) did for the Manhattan Project in 1944. Comparing our testing proposal to Enrico Fermi's nuclear pile test may seem like a bit of a stretch but in reality, it's really quite similar in two key areas.

First, they are both one-off tests to confirm or deny a specific principle and so there will never be another one required. Second is the concept of scale. Many outcomes can be successfully tested in the laboratory as miniaturized versions of the real thing but one has to be very cognizant of the fact that when you do eventually scale up to the real world, the magnitude of the forces involved can very easily overwhelm the entire process and make the whole thing unmanageable and unreliable. In Fermi's case, his pile was of sufficient size to not only determine the feasibility of the bomb (the easy "instant" part) but also the practical feasibility of creating a *controlled* chain reaction not just for seconds but for hours on end. Once that is accomplished, the task of expanding that to years on end is not easy but it is relatively straight forward from an engineering point of view.

In the final analysis, that one-off test gave birth to our nuclear power industry. This is especially true of our CANDU nuclear power design that to this day, still has the highest accident free online power rating in the world. It truly is the 8th wonder of the world. I ought to know because I was part of it in the 1980's and I saw first hand what high quality engineering and skilled trades can do. If you should decide to go ahead with this project, that model is precisely how it must be handled from start to finish. Like Fermi's test, we only get one shot at it and so we have to get it right the first time out.



Our ACTS design is scaled precisely the same way and for the same reason and because of that, it is expensive. I estimate an overall budget of \$250 million but compared to the trillions that you are all about to unload on taxpayers (especially you Mr. Biden) for electric car subsidies, it's a pittance. In the end, it is a very inexpensive litmus test to finally determine whether this massive subsidy is a wise or foolish investment. It's high time for the soft scientific rubber to meet the hard engineering road. It's no different for us than it was for Galileo, Newton, Boyle, Joule, Faraday and Einstein. The days of doing earth shattering experiments on the cheap are over.

Finally I would like to propose a rather novel financing arrangement for your consideration. There is no question that the entire world will benefit from our ACTS program but let's just look at it from our own self interest point of view for the moment. Simply put, the G7 countries own most of the wealth and so we have the most to lose. We have roughly 750 million citizens in our G7 and let us assume that each one of them is willing to contribute \$1 to this undertaking. This gives us a fund of \$750 million to work with of which \$250 million (say) is for the work itself. This leaves a balance of \$500 million to be given to the country that gets closest to the actual result for atmospheric temperature change ie, ECS at CO2 of 800 ppm. It's somewhere between 0°C and 5.3°C and so, place your bets. Time is of the essence. Please let me know your thoughts by return mail at your earliest convenience. I look forward to hearing from you and I remain;

Yours truly,

Kenneth G. Dextras, B. Eng., McGill '76
Managing Partner