

To: Paul Barclay <barclay.paul@abc.net.au>
From: george blahusiak <georgebl@iprimus.com.au>
Subject: Nuclear Power
Cc:
Bcc:
Attached:

Dear Paul,

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak on the subject of nuclear energy on Monday, 29 May 2006.

I applaud the people who use renewable energy to power their homes.

Unfortunately such systems will do essentially nothing to alleviate the current crisis.

The Annual Report of the Office of Energy in WA shows that domestic energy consumption is only three (3) percent of total consumption.

You suggest saving energy by simply using low energy lights in our homes. To what end? Such a move would reduce our energy consumption by less than one (1) percent!!!

A number of your callers suggested that every building have energy collectors to reduce our reliance on coal. Yet listening to the comments of those callers it appears quite clear that none of them has given the slightest thought to exactly what this implies both in terms of construction and cost. It appeared as nothing more than wishful thinking.

Your caller, Michael for example, tells us that he spent \$5,000 installing renewable and low energy devices in his home. Based on the figures above, would Michael, or anyone else, be prepared to spend \$150,000 to install sufficient collectors to satisfy his share of society's total energy needs?

And remember, Michael's comments are based on low domestic consumption. He says nothing about industrial consumption. Based on his comments it is quite probable that his domestic consumption is only two (2) percent, or less, of total energy consumption. In that case the total cost of renewable energy devices would rise to \$200,000 PER HOUSEHOLD.

Likewise, Michael does not tell us when he installed his renewable energy devices. Would the cost be the same today?

I will repeat, we need nuclear energy, but unfortunately governments have shown that they have what appears to be an infinite capacity to lie to the public on the dangers and safety of nuclear power. If we go down the nuclear path the safeguards must be rigorous and rigorously enforced.

Finally, I turn to the consequences of using solar energy, which has its own problems.

One will not be able to put solar collectors in areas of low solar insolation. They will be put in areas of high insolation, usually deserts for bulk energy collection. But, those deserts reflect

huge amounts of energy straight back out into space. By putting solar collectors in deserts we will be absorbing more energy thus adding to the global warming problem, not reducing it. Even putting solar collectors on the average suburban roof will add to the problem.

All in all I am reminded of the old adage, cynical though it may be. "Please ensure that the brain is running before putting the mouth in gear." In other words, do your sums FIRST not second. It saves a lot of time and grief.

Finally I include for your perusal an e-mail that I sent to every member of Federal Parliament BEFORE the current debate was opened. I, along with other people, probably started the nuclear debate (although I don't know anyone who would be prepared to admit to my participation). It was also sent to several of the major uranium miners, some of whom sent considerate replies. And by the way, I don't have an interest in uranium.

IN CLOSING, I REPEAT, DO YOUR SUMS FIRST! Yes, people have a right to express their opinions, but the those opinions must be based on fact, not on fear.

Yours,

George in Perth

George Blahusiak

805/32 Dumond Street
Bentley, W.A., 6102

Tel: (08) 9458-9484

+++++ Advice to Members of Federal Parliament +++++

The recent blueprint on climate change from Kim Beazley prompts me to write to you.

The blueprint, with its emphasis on solar and other renewable forms of energy, shows a remarkable shallowness of thought coupled with a terrible lack of foresight. In some respects it may even be incorrect, leading to Australia becoming a backwater, the poor white thrash of Asia I believe someone once said.

Let me start with some basics, because it is clear from the current debate that there is a vast lack of understanding of the problems associated with solar and other forms of renewable energy.

The solar constant, the energy the Earth receives from the Sun, the figure we all live by, is 8.37 joules (2 small calories) per square centimeter at the nominal distance of the Earth from the Sun. Due to atmospheric absorption the amount reaching the ground at normal incidence, that is, when the Sun is directly overhead, is only 5.86 joules (1.4 small calories) per square centimeter. This figure is available in almost every high school science book.

As anyone, even a Labor politician, would well know, the Sun isn't directly overhead at all