

John Hawkins
Committee Secretary
Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

**To the Select Committee on Climate Policy to inquire into
policies relating to climate change.**

My submission relates to section (f) of the terms of the inquiry (any related matter) and I will keep it very brief.

My name is Cornelis J.F. SMIT; I hold a BSc (in Chemistry and Metallurgy) from the University of Melbourne; I am a Fellow of the AusIMM, a CP(Env.) (Chartered Professional in the environmental field), a CIH(ret) (retired Certified Industrial Hygienist) and I headed a company providing independent environmental services to government and industry for 20 years. I am 71 years of age and have no association with energy, tobacco or other industries that might be considered as having an interest in climate change. In my retirement I daily read extensively on the subject of climate change.

Before the Government implements any action on Climate Change, I believe it should review all relevant scientific facts, not just that information accepted by the IPCC. There are good reasons for believing that the IPCC simply followed the many scientists who had discovered a major source of research funding by relating their projects to “Global Warming” (now known as “Climate Change”). The IPCC ignores “natural” causes for climate changes because IPCC’s mandate is to investigate the effect of human emissions on global temperature—and they vigorously ignore other possible causes.

Just a few of the reasons why the Select Committee should decide to rule out the introduction of any legislation aimed at affecting “Climate Change”:

Global Temperature.

The measurements used to demonstrate global temperature are notoriously prone to interpretation. Measuring stations located on the ground are generally concentrated around populated areas where the temperature is affected by human activity including the proximity of roads or structures. Also, whether these temperatures are recorded at dawn, noon or midnight can obviously have huge impact on the reading. Whether the station is located at sea level or on a hill can similarly affect the reading. The “Global Temperature” quoted by the proponents of Global Warming is usually terrestrially based and is a figment of so many corrections and approximations that there must be a serious doubt about its value.

While also open to interpretation, satellite readings are more believable but they have only been available since about 1970.

Carbon Dioxide levels.

Of the estimated 186 billion tons of CO₂ entering the atmosphere annually, only about 6 billion tons can be associated with human activity; the 180 billion tons come from biological activity in the oceans, volcanoes, decaying plants and of course, bush fires. Historically, atmospheric CO₂ levels rise during (and following) a period of warming. This is mostly due to release of this gas from solution in the oceans. Also historically, atmospheric CO₂ levels have been much higher than today, long before mankind could have made any contribution. Also, the most recent cooling period occurred from 1940 -1970 when human activity could already be regarded as responsible for substantial CO₂ emissions.

Solar Influence.

The fact that the major source of energy on earth is the sun, has been ignored by the modelling used to predict “Global Warming”. The sun’s energy output fluctuates, as does its ability to deflect cosmic rays from the earth. Its activity was high during the last few decades of last century and has decreased markedly in recent years giving rise, in the opinion of acknowledged experts, to a possible descent into a period of global cooling, even a new “Ice Age”.

Climate modelling.

Even the quoted “global temperature” records show that there has been no increase (and actually some decrease) since 1998. So we have at least a decade so far, with no warming while “greenhouse gas” emissions have increased significantly. None of the models used by the proponents of “Global Warming” predicted this lack of continuing temperature rise. Attempts to explain this, boil down to it being caused by “natural events” such as El Nino and La Nina which while major influences on the weather, are not understood and have not been included in the various climate models.

Conclusion.

Given the uncertainties and incorrect science that underpins the “Global Warming”, it would be a mistake for the Federal Parliament to legislate for the introduction of a scheme that will damage our total economy.