

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Michael McRobie Jameson

Reference no: 2170

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

I do not believe that the science that says CO2 is the sole source of Global Warming. Indeed has the IPCC or the Paris Accord specified what the density of CO2 in the atmosphere should be? Trying to set a country's target without a global target makes no sense at all, particularly when any of the reductions being proposed are going to reduce New Zealand's GDP by up to 22%.

Clause

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

Notes

The target should be set ONLY AFTER it is clearly established that CO2 density is clearly linked to hemispherical temperature control; the sensitivity of hemispherical temperature in relation to CO2 density; and the density that is to be attained to maintain temperatures, is specified and internationally accepted. It is difficult to believe however that the rise in CO2 density between 1958 and 2017 [310 ppm to 400 ppm], a .00009% increase, is solely responsible for the temperature rises.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

Who, apart from the Minister and his entourage, says New Zealand should have an established target of zero emissions? Such a move, which will reduce the wealth of its citizens, seemingly to set an "example" to the rest of the world, seems to be a poor return for our Country.

Clause

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

Notes

The Bill should NOT SEE THE LIGHT OF DAY!!!!

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

This Government clearly does not have the welfare of New Zealand citizens within their philosophy when they recognise that there will be increased hardship by the poorest of our Country, but they propose to offset this by welfare payments being made from the reducing GDP. This seems to be Marxist wealth redistribution in disguise.

Clause

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

Notes

There should be NO EMISSION BUDGET set until the sensitivity of climate change to CO2 density is clearly established and an agreed Global CO2 density is established!

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

Notes

What is the point of reviewing something that should not be established until the sensitivity of climate to CO2 is able to be quantified and proven!!

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

How about some proper science, not science based on manipulated data and alarmist statements talking about 70 cm sea rise. An Australian study, based on some 69 measuring points around the Australian coastline, estimates a 3 - 5 cm rise this century. The Minister wishes to incorporate agriculture emissions into the mix because of methane and CO2 release. Is he also intending to include humans who exhale CO2 at a density of 40,000 ppm at every breath cycle?

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

How can any Government set plans when the emission budgets are entirely artificial, and such budgets are going to result in reducing the Country's wealth by up to 22%

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

WORK WITH: 1. The 68% of climatologists who currently do not support the theory that CO2 emissions are the sole source of climate change; and 2. Climate model makers that are able to produce predictions that are believable and do not manipulate data. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION: 1. Maintenance of the economy in a growth mode; 2. Cease attempting to ameliorate introduced hardships by wealth redistribution; 3. Work with the Country's citizens; and 4. Prove to citizens that CO2 Density is the prime influence on hemispherical temperatures [32% of climatologists in agreement is NOT enough];

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 only thing the Commission should be advising on is what best science is able to predict with at least a 75% certainty of what aspects and their most probable extent, will be impacted on by climate change in order to assist in the preparation of amelioration of the threats.

Clause

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

Notes

NONE - The need for a trading scheme has the same merit as Canute had in holding back the tide and only helps contribute to increasing costs for no real return.

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

Position

No

Notes

Climatologists, Physicists, Geologists, Biologists, Economists, Industrialists, and Engineers. There is no need for specific Maori membership or consideration as their needs are no different to any other New Zealand Citizen

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

All that could be included at the moment is generalities without any certain level of impact. Adaption can only come after better science is able to predict with a greater level of certainty.

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

The proposed functions in and of themselves appear to be sensible, but they must be backed by science that has at least a 70% certainty in order to be meaningful and relevant. We are a long way from that situation and this is where research and development should be directed before we embark on a programme that weakens our economy.

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

No

Notes

Setting up TARGETED ADAPTION reporting power sounds a bit like HG Wells "1984". Once SCIENCE and NOT POLITICAL IDEOLOGY is driving our research, then if reporting is justified the individuals and organisations that need to contribute will readily see and become engaged without "Big Brother" driving them.

Clause

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

Notes

I thought that there was supposed to be a DISCUSSION, but in fact we are required to accept the Minister is correct - CO2 Emissions are the cause of all our problems - and only discuss how far are we prepared to go to restrict its release to atmosphere. I think the discussion needs to start a few steps earlier before we start to close down our economy!!!!. I also think that all citizens need to be given real data, not subjective ideology and alarmist statements, so that they are able to endorse or discard the shrinking of our economy by way of binding referendum. At the very least, they need to have a clear picture of what life in our country will look like with the withdrawal of hydrocarbons [the most cost efficient and concentrated source of energy currently available to humanity], and a clear plan on how this energy source will be replaced given that: 1. wind and solar energy require more energy and resources to manufacture than they are able to generate [ask Germany and Scandinavia who have said that these sources cannot replace hydrocarbons]; 2. Nuclear energy is currently denied to New Zealanders by current legislation; and 3. Hydro energy resources are all-but at maximum capacity. How any Government could deliberately commit its population to a reducing standard of living is difficult to comprehend. It is time to STOP treating CO2 as a pollutant - it is not. ASK ANY PLANT!