

WRITTEN QUESTION E-1089/09
by Ashley Mote (NI)
to the Commission

Subject: Carbon dioxide myth

Why does the Commission cling to the myth that switching to low-energy light bulbs will cut carbon dioxide emissions, and that this is a good thing? Is not the notion totally meaningless, since carbon dioxide (CO₂) is not a pollutant? It is a useful gas – so useful that we need it to exist. Do not all plants totally depend on it to survive and produce the oxygen we need?

Did not dinosaurs feed from abundant vegetation because there was at least three times more CO₂ in the atmosphere then than now? Is not global warming another totally meaningless and utterly misleading phrase? The world temperature is actually going down, in spite of CO₂ emissions shooting upwards, thanks to China and India.

Does the Commission not know that the carbon impact on climate change (if any) is logarithmic, not arithmetic? In a phrase, that means the more the change, the less the effect.