

BMA sponsors two awards for students

MORE than 80 students received academic, sporting, service and workplace awards at the 2009 Dysart State High School presentation evening held last month.

BMA sponsored two awards – one for the Most Outstanding Academic Student for the year and one for the Most Outstanding Year 10 Student.

The awards were attended by special guests including Member for Mirani Ted Malone, Mayor of Isaac Regional Council Cedric Marshall, general manager of BMA's Norwich



MINING NEWS

Park Mine, Gus Gomes, and Peter Sharpe, general manager of BMA's Saraji Mine.

The event was well attended with over 300 guests, family, friends, teachers and students filling the auditorium of the Dysart Civic Centre.

In presenting the two BMA-sponsored awards Peter Sharpe said: "It's an honour for BMA to be

associated with this awards evening and especially these two awards which demonstrate high academic achievement."

In addition to the awards ceremony, the evening showcased the Dysart State High School Rock Band, which performed several times during the evening.

Art students also displayed their work completed throughout the year.

The home economics class left a lasting impression by providing dinner for the guests.



TOP PERFORMERS: (From left): Gus Gomes, general manager, Norwich Park Mine, Tiarne Wanchap (Year 10), Scott Whybird, principal of Dysart State High School, Paige Wanchap (Year 12) and Peter Sharpe, general manager BMA's Saraji Mine.

PHOTO: SUPPLIED

Myths about coal up in smoke

OPINION



Terence Cardwell.
PHOTO: SUPPLIED

I HAVE sat by for a number of years frustrated at the rubbish being put forth about carbon dioxide emissions, thermal coal-fired power stations and renewable energy and the ridiculous Emissions Trading Scheme, in frustration at the lies told (particularly during the election) about global pollution. Using power station cooling towers for an example, the condensation coming from those cooling towers is as pure as that that comes out of any kettle.

I have been frustrated about the so-called man-made carbon emissions which of course are carbon dioxide emissions and what they are supposedly doing to our planet.

I have been further frustrated with the lies told about renewable energy and the deliberate distortion of renewable energy and its ability to replace fossil fuel energy generation;

and frustration at the ridiculous carbon credit program or emission trading scheme, which is beyond comprehension.

And further frustrated at some of the public who haven't got a clue about thermal power stations or renewable energy, quoting ridiculous figures about something they have little or no knowledge of.

First, coal-fired power stations do NOT send 60 to 70% of the energy up the chimney. The boilers of modern power stations are 96% efficient and the exhaust heat is captured by the economisers and reheaters and heat the air and water before entering the boilers.

The very slight amount exiting the stack is moist as in condensation and CO2. There is virtually no fly ash because this is removed by the precipitators or bagging plants that are 99.98% efficient. The 4% lost is heat through boiler

wall convection.

Coal-fired power stations are highly efficient with very little heat loss and can generate massive amounts of energy for our needs. They can generate power at efficiency of less than 10000b.t.u. per kilowatt and cost-wise that is very low. The percentage cost of mining and freight is very low. The total cost of fuel is 8% of total generation cost and does NOT constitute a major production cost.

As for being laughed out of the country, China is building multitudes of coal-fired power stations because they are the most efficient for bulk power generation. We, like the USA, have coal-fired power stations because we HAVE the raw ma-

terials and are VERY fortunate to have them. Believe me, no one is laughing at Australia – exactly the reverse. They are very envious of our raw materials and independence.

The major percentage of power in Europe and UK is nuclear because they don't have the coal supply for the future.

Yes, it would be very nice to have clean, quiet, cheap energy in bulk supply. Everyone agrees that it would be ideal. You don't have to be a genius to work that out.

But there is only one problem: it doesn't exist.

Yes, there are wind and solar generators being built all over the world, but they only add a small amount to the overall power demand. Based on an average generating output of 1.5 megawatts for wind generators (of unreliable power) you would require over 33,300 wind generators.

As for solar power generation, much research has been done over the decades and there are two types, solar thermal gener-

ation and solar electric generation, but in each case they cannot generate large amounts of electricity.

Any clean, cheap energy is obviously welcomed, but they would NEVER have the capability of replacing thermal power generation. So get your heads out of the clouds, do some basic mathematics and look at the facts. Don't go off with the fairies (or some

“We are all greenies in one form or another and care very much about our planet. The difference is most of us are realistic

would say the extreme greenies).

We are all greenies in one form or another and care very much about our planet. The difference is most of us are realistic, and are not in some idyllic utopia where every-

thing can be made perfect by standing around holding a banner.

Here are some facts that will show how ridiculous this government is. Do the simple maths and see for yourselves.

According to the “believers”, the CO2 in air has risen from .034% to .038% in air over the last 50 years.

To put the percentage of carbon dioxide in air in a clearer perspective;

If you had a room 12ft x 12ft x 7ft or 3.7m x 3.7m x 2.1m, the area carbon dioxide would occupy in that room would be .25m x .25m x .17m or the size of a large packet of cereal.

Australia emits 1% of the world's total carbon dioxide and the government wants to reduce this by 20% or reduce emissions by 0.2% of the world's total CO2 emissions.

What effect will this have on existing CO2 levels?

By their own figures they state the CO2 in air has risen from .034% to .038% in 50 years.

Assuming this is correct, the world CO2

has increased in 50 years by .004%.

Per year that is .004 divided by 50 = .00008%.

(Getting confusing – but stay with me)

Of that 1%, because we only contribute 1%, our emissions would cause CO2 to rise .00008 divided by 100 = .0000008%.

Of that 1% we supposedly emit, the government wants to reduce it by 20%, which is 1/5th of .0000008 = .0000016% effect per year they would have on the world CO2 emissions, based on their own figures.

That would equate to an area in the same room the size of a small pin!

For that they have gone crazy with the ridiculous trading schemes, solar and roofing installations, clean coal technology, renewable energy, etc, etc.

How ridiculous is that? The cost to the general public and industry will be enormous, crippling and even closing some smaller business.

T.L. Cardwell,
North Rockhampton.

WHO SPONSORS OUR KIDS THROUGH NEWSPAPERS IN EDUCATION?

PLATINUM SPONSORS



GOLD SPONSORS

