Clause 1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

Notes
The science of man-made global warming is not settled. Zero emission targets based on ideologies and not settled science is not a sound policy. Your plan must be based on cold, hard scientific numbers only. Your plan is destructive, not constructive.

Clause 2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

Notes
A target based on settled science is the best option. The climate models have been dis-proved time and time again. India and China are the two largest emitters of CO2 and it is common knowledge that these countries, including Germany, Japan, and France, plan to construct 1,600+ coal-fired power plants.

Clause 3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes
NZs contribution to global carbon dioxide emissions is negligible (close to zero). Rather than legislate a new emissions target for NZ, focus efforts to convince President Xi Jinping or Prime Minister, Narendra Modi to follow your proposed tax theory to reduce CO2 emissions, then your effort would be laudable within your ideological drive.

Clause 4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?

Position
Yes

Notes
Your advisors knowledge of science is wrong. Use of the expression Carbon Bill and not Carbon Dioxide bill is evidence of that. The target, if NZ needs one, should be based on settled science.

Clause 5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?

Position
No

Notes
The emission budgets should focus on reviewing and improving efforts to convince President Xi Jinping or Prime Minister, Narendra Modi to follow your proposed tax theory to reduce their countries CO2 emissions.

Clause 6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

Position
Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

Notes
Based on a NZ Governments budget to put pressure on the big global CO2 polluters.

Clause 7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under exceptional circumstances? See p36 Our Climate Your Say

Position
Yes

Notes
Based on a NZ Governments budget to put pressure on the big global CO2 polluters.
Clause 8. Do you agree with the considerations we propose that the Government and the Climate Change Commission take into account when advising on and setting budgets? See p44 Our Climate Your Say

Position
No
Notes
NZ Government have not considered all arguments of the global warming science. It is now common knowledge that global temperatures have not increased in the last 20 years. Other countries (including India and China) still plan to construct coal fired power stations, which will increase CO2 emissions significantly (+40% estimated). So a net zero carbon dioxide emission reduction by NZ is a futile exercise and will do next to nothing for global emissions. The bill will hurt NZ residents.

Clause 9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Position
No
Notes
Timeframe means nothing if the decisions are based on the wrong scientific conclusions.

Clause 10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?

Notes
The science of man-made global warming is not settled. Zero emission targets based on ideologies and not settled science is not a sound policy. Your plan must be based on cold, hard scientific numbers only. Your plan is destructive, not constructive. NZ's contribution to global carbon dioxide emissions is negligible (close to zero). Rather than legislate a new emissions target for NZ, focus efforts to convince President Xi Jinping or Prime Minister, Narendra Modi to follow your proposed tax theory to reduce CO2 emissions, then your effort would be laudable within your ideological drive.

Clause 11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions? See p42 Our Climate Your Say

Position
No
Notes
The goals do not includes all sides of the global warming science. It is now common knowledge that global temperatures have not increased in the last 20 years. Other countries (including India and China) still plan to construct coal fired power stations, which will increase CO2 emissions significantly (+40% estimated). So a net zero carbon dioxide emission reduction by NZ is a futile exercise and will do next to nothing for global emissions. The bill will hurt NZ residents.

Clause 12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Position
Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS
Notes
The Emission Trading Scheme has been tried in many countries and has not worked. It did not work in the NZ forestry industry. Why should a ETS scheme work in NZ now??? It was thrown out of Australia and Ontario Canada are now on their way do do the same. All it does is hurt the poor of the population. I think if you are serious in imposing a ETS scheme in NZ, there is likely to be a revolt of the population like in Ontario Canada. One other question "how much will the CO2 emissions reduce with a ETS scheme?"

Clause 13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise? See p45 Our Climate Your Say

Notes
Unfortunately, this is about science and simple numbers, not ideologies. Your New Zealand CO2 tax may reduce global CO2 emissions by less than 0.00001%. When you subtract that from emissions from India and China it segues from laudable to laughable.

Clause 14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?

Position
Yes
Notes
Provided the bill is renamed "Zero Carbon Dioxide Bill" and it has been based on sound science which considers all aspects and all sides of the global warming argument.
Clause
15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? See p47 Our Climate Your Say

Position
No

Notes
What do the government mean by climate change, if it means global warming, there has been no global warming for the last 20 years! Why do we need to adapt?

Clause
16. Should we explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?

Position
Yes

Notes
As long as they are allowed to debate both sides of the argument. Not just one sided as is happening now.

Clause
Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

Notes
The science of man-made global warming is not settled. Zero emission targets based on ideologies and not settled science is not a sound policy. Your plan must be based on cold, hard scientific numbers only. Your plan is destructive, not constructive. India and China are the two largest emitters of CO2 and it is common knowledge that these countries, including Germany, Japan, and France, plan to construct 1,600+ coal-fired power plants. NZs contribution to global carbon dioxide emissions is negligible (close to zero). Rather than legislate a new emissions target for NZ, focus efforts to convince President Xi Jinping or Prime Minister, Narendra Modi to follow your proposed tax theory to reduce CO2 emissions, then your effort would be laudable within your ideological drive. Your advisors knowledge of science is wrong. Use of the expression Carbon Bill and not Carbon Dioxide bill is evidence of that. The target, if NZ needs one, should be based on settled science. NZ Government have not considered all arguments of the global warming science. It is now common knowledge that global temperatures have not increased in the last 20 years. Other countries (including India and China) still plan to construct coal fired power stations, which will increase CO2 emissions significantly (+40% estimated). So a net zero carbon dioxide emission reduction by NZ is a futile exercise and will do next to nothing for global emissions. The bill will hurt NZ residents.