

## GARNAUT REPORT SUBMISSION

Please accept my submission as per your terms of reference.

1/ Human induced climate change is still very much a hypothesis. There is still no evidence that conclusively supports that theory.

Although there are computer models that predict that it should happen to varying degrees, they are programmed with assumptions that are unproven.

It is generally thought that the earth, coming out of the Little Ice Age, is in a warming cycle of around 0.5C per century.

There are other known natural influences to our current warming trend such as solar variations, ocean oscillations, el Niño, etc. and with only a total warming [confirmed by all available data] of around 0.8C per century, there cannot be much of this actual warming that can be attributed to human caused greenhouse gasses.

In the last decade there has been phenomenal increases in man made CO<sub>2</sub> by emerging economies such as China, India, Indonesia, Brazil, etc.[it has been said to equate to a new Germany coming on stream EVERY year], yet the world has not registered any overall warming during this time.

Does not this indicate that some of those computer model assumptions are poorly understood?

If these large increases in greenhouse gasses are not causing significant warming, it seems unwise to make onerous changes to our lifestyle to correct a none too specific problem.

2&3/ Overall international endeavours are not reducing GHGs and probably never will unless and until there are huge increases in nuclear energy world wide.

The effects of renewable energy systems have not led to the closure of ANY fossil fuel based power station ANYWHERE.

Take one of Australia's examples in this area: - Windorah, a town in the far south-west of Queensland with a population of 100 is getting a \$4million solar reflector power station costing \$40,000 per head.

As it will only work in sunshine the existing diesel generator will still have to provide the bulk of the power to the town. Also these mirror reflectors in a dust prone environment will require a lot of maintenance and will not last indefinitely. Sand blasting will soon dull the reflectivity of the mirrors.

This type of renewable solution is comparable to that which is happening world wide and economically seems very questionable. Even frightening!

4/ The best possible outcome for Australia [and the world] is to be reasonably aware of what is really happening based on fact [as opposed to dubious global computer modelling] and act accordingly.

Until we are certain of the problem and as a precaution we should, like France and many similar countries, introduce nuclear power [which this country's in a unique position to take advantage of] which would solve a lot of problems yet create few. This even has the capacity to produce hydrogen for GHG-free vehicle fuel and desalinated water.

There are about 440 nuclear reactors in the world with another 200 in progress, planned or proposed.

They are in countries populated by intelligent people, largely governed by democracies. Economically and environmentally this is way ahead of other current proposals I am aware of.

It just needs political courage but this government could do it whereas possibly no other could.

Please also read Dr. Syun-Ichi Akasofu's thoughts on climate change here:

[http://thenewamerican.com/node/6973/print#SlideFrame\\_1](http://thenewamerican.com/node/6973/print#SlideFrame_1)

Please also read Dr. Dennis Jensen MP here:

<http://www.lavoisier.com.au/papers/articles/NineFactsJensen.html>

Please also read Dr. Gerhard Gerlich and Ralf D. Tscheuschner's summary here:

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.1161>

Jim Inglis. 12/02/08

North Tamborine Qld.