

Interim
Submission

29/7/2008

Senate Select Committee
on Fuel & Energy

My interim points are set out below. I am making
th - as a citizen for your consideration

Initiatives on fuel and energy should ideally not
be divisive. Co-operation should be encouraged.

There will be different views but people may
agree on some starting position, eg all Australians
(or interest groups) don't support climate change
theory, but they can accept that air pollution
generally has become damaging to health & the
environment anyway, in various ways.

On the immediate issue of the higher fuel prices we
have had, I read that ethanol could be added further to
blend petrol, but it used to be too expensive. But is
it now and may there be other possible blends?

There are many different ideas floating about on
long term energy solutions. I see this as positive,
even if each of us don't agree with them all.

In the short term, it may be possible to improve
on what we have to reduce emissions, (a) electrolytic
converter type boxes in cars and (b) industrial scrubbers.

Electric cars were built early on in the motor vehicle industry. It must be also feasible to use less petrol for lower speeds and ranges, by further refinement in hybrid cars which we already have now.

Fuels can be pre treated to reduce emissions, I have read. Companies & others doing such research should be supported.

Though a carbon trading scheme has been presented as the answer, it has partly fallen down in that big polluters are exempt. It does not have to be that only that is looked at. We should all try to avoid getting into a corner in our options, as with oil before.

I accept that India & China are going to be big polluters, on projected trends. However to criticize the Australian Govt for taking initiatives is petty. I support any country that tries to do something. We all have to think about the future. Why not have Australia spearheading some plans? Some other countries do too.

Different 'stakeholders' in the issues here to accept each other. In general, anyone can get carried away with their line of thought, eg incl. share holders of a co. Balance should be aimed for. Exploration Companies can get carried away too.

In the 90's business interests became further divided from society generally, in my opinion. It is helpful if the contribution of community / family activities (& groups) to making pleasant town / city

environs is acknowledged, by business as the latter benefits from that. Community type activities are often undervalued. Why can't we look at this? It may be possible to have some trade offs.

I also don't want a boring and conflict ridden way of both looking at or solving issues, for the sake of Australia. It could be made interesting instead.

Though I accept global warming, I am still interested in what the dissenting scientists have to say & we should all try to at least listen.

Some scientists think climate instability could tip the world into a new cooling period. It maybe that current scientific thought is incomplete. There ^{could} ~~may~~ be a big cycle in operation, or other factors. As well there is a marked increase in earth tremors, incl. in the sea floor.

What I accept - man made emissions are causing a no. of serious negative effects, incl. acidification - often overlooked. So something must be done.

I want to be able to look at the reasons for different ideas that people have & what supports that.

On managing economic interests involved - the usual business & boss/worker conflicts that are ongoing are not positive. Set in boom/bust cycles, how is this good for society? Surely the only alternative is not dreadful communism? Why can't we become advanced & ensure that each person has circumstances to achieve the great potential that, it has emerged, each of us has?

-4-

also - ^{on} economic - with one lot trying to do another lot in^s - how is this cohesive?

We are all in a time of flux, or may be even approaching an upheaval. At such times human beings can be fearful or look to the past. Instead we can try to embrace change and look to the new. ^{also - try to reduce} enmities.

Box and either/or thinking that gets us into difficulties should be avoided. A no. of solutions may have merit, not just one. I hope the usual tired & reflexive manoeuvrings can be avoided. We could become more advanced, not less, facing up to what has been wrong before.

The climate instability/energy issues are an opportunity for international relations, overcoming the usual barriers.

I may send in further in a final submission(s) as there are further technical points I want to check on.

Yours sincerely,
Christine White-Head

30/7

20/8/2008

Senate Select Committee
on Fuel and Energy

I sent a submission in to the Committee on 29/7.
Extra points to add to that are set out below.

- Diesel Engines have greater fuel economy compared to other conventional ones, can use a variety of 'fuels' & even waste products from other processes, so may be a better option if the dirty emissions can be cleaned up in the ways available (see earlier points).
- on the long term nuclear option, I don't agree with it, though possibly not for the usual reasons. It is not uranium mining by itself, though I think tailings are a hazard, but what that is linked to that can't be evaded as a responsibility. I have set this out on additional pages.

I request that what I am sending in this final letter be looked at along with my earlier submission.

Yours sincerely,
Christine White-Head

On long term Nuclear option

During the nuclear test era many Soviet scientists (incl. geneticists) would not give their endorsement to their government's nuclear test programme, which they saw as inflicting genetic roulette and preferred prison camps to doing so.

All their reasons and what they knew may not be available to us now, but their stance echoes across the decades to us.

The nuclear reaction is once again being put forward as a viable option to generate electricity. As an unwieldy industry, involving many steps that are cumbersome and require monitoring as no other, it may not be cheaper even when all is taken into account.

However that is not even the worst thing about it, but that our ethics and thereby ourselves are reduced by the suspect agreements put forward.

It may be the case that there are nuclear proponents who are prepared to live with the risks involved, after an honest risk assessment. (Nor do we know similar risks in other options)

But to say that Canada can mine uranium, or some African country, anyway is a shabby argument when we know that if we feel strongly that it is wrong we could lobby Canada not to. Likewise other cop-outs and evasions.

To say that the risk of plutonium theft or of a Chernobyl type scenario has nothing to do with our uranium mining is also shabby.

Those Soviet scientists back in the 1950's

made choices they could live with, even if that meant forgoing privileges and comfort and even being forgotten about later.

To deny that such choices matter to us or even should is to deny that human beings have a higher mind and were meant to think. In a sea of Divine Mind, we were meant to progress.

As to whether this is a real oil crisis and not a phoney one, as back in the early 70's, I do not really know. I am assuming it is so.

Are we really limited to the alternatives that are being presented - I do not really know if there is 'hidden' technology.

As a further pt - we are only looking at all this in terms of the existing set up we have in society is continuing on from it. Some advanced way of looking differently at these matters may yet start to form.