

My name is Neil Killion and I am the Co-Founder and Organiser for Climate and Energy Realists Queensland. We are also part of the National Rational Energy Network (NREM). I am quoting from their central document, which perfectly sums up our position as well.

“Renewable energy has developed a reputation as being environmentally friendly. This report will show that this reputation is entirely undeserved. Far from improving the world around us, wind, solar, biomass and even hydropower can be highly damaging. A renewables revolution on the scale envisaged by global warming activists will see our landscapes desecrated, our fields industrialised or turned to monocultures, and our wildlife slaughtered.

Far from making the world a better place, renewable energy will destroy all we hold dear. Is this really what environmentalism has come to mean?”

In addition I will add comments made to a submission on ‘Proposals For REZ’s in SEQ’. I’m doing this because your inquiry seeks a ‘Public Licence’ that does not exist. Basically you define the issue as, ‘saving the planet’, and the only question is ‘how do you go about it’? But what ‘IF’ the very foundations of your argument are wrong? Rural and Regional Australians are suffering under your illusions. Accepting responses from activist inner-city residents only waters down the true picture.

“The problem is that you are simply seeking comments on 'HOW' you would roll out your plans for 'Renewable' Energy (This term is more accurately described as:- 'Intermittent', 'Unreliable' Energy). We would contest that the real question should be 'IF' it's rolled out. Any new energy options should be based on affordability, reliability, toxicity and environmental impact.

We would contest that the claims for your proposals being 'clean', 'green' and 'cheap' are incorrect. Far from being 'clean', wind/solar and other options contain multiple toxins that are hazardous to the environment generally and could be potentially catastrophic if it poisons the earth or water supplies.

Neither are they 'green' in the sense that wind and sunshine are natural, so wind/solar facilities must be as well. They require large areas of land; which includes pristine bushland, precious flora and fauna and marine mammals if you include offshore options. They also cannot be made without the very, 'traditional organic energy sources' that are demonised and used as a justification for the total program.

Finally they are anything but 'cheap'. So much so, that unless very costly government subsidies are continuously provided any company that builds them would go bankrupt in short order. The transmission cost alone is going to put huge imposts on the nation's economy, plunging it into dangerous levels of debt.

Ordinary people and SME's are already feeling the pinch and costs are only going to accelerate.

We feel there should be a moratorium placed on this rollout process and a full public debate be held with all energy options on the table. If a 'climate emergency' is used as the overriding justification of all this expense, then this should also form a central part of the debate; since so far all predictions of future gloom and doom have proved false over the many decades that they have been made known to the public.

We are calling for a calm and measured approach, not a chaotic and random one."