

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 2569

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

There is no real scientific proof that carbon dioxide (man made or nature made) causes any significant global warming. What is scientifically proven is that CO2 levels have been proven to increase AFTER significant changes to the global temperature. This is because the oceans are by far the greatest reservoir of CO2 and as is well proven, the CO2 holding capacity of water is reduced as temperature increases. The presumption in this discussion document is unscientific ab initio, and as such, is not valid for any purpose other than propaganda purposes. The climate has always changed and will continue to do so in a manner that mankind cannot materially influence, other than by catastrophic nuclear war waged across the world. The consensus argument bandied about is a complete nonsense. And it is sad today that scientists who do not "buy into" the politically driven consensus risk their careers and funding. In my opinion, this disqualifies the so-called scientific consensus. Fortunately, in New Zealand, we still have freedom of expression, a fundamental right and historically, questioning so-called consensus in science has led to many corrections and scientific breakthroughs, all of which have benefited mankind.

Clause

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

Notes

as per 1

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

as per 1

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

per 1 As countries realize that CO2 has no significant bearing on normal climate change, and as the costs of implementing expensive measures escalate in vain attempts to chase targets which achieve absolutely nothing of significance, the economic and political reality will ensure that this wasteful expenditure will cease and used for real economic and social upliftment projects. In a recent discussion on SkyTV Australia, it was revealed that no cost-benefit analysis had been done, and that in fact, Australia could shut down it's entire economy and the ultimate effect would not be detectable at any statistically significant number in the climate change forecast models.

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

Per 1

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

Any incoming democratically elected government should have full rights to dismantle any prior legislation imposed. To deny this is to deny the very essence of democracy.

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

per 1 plus, because as the political consensus realizes that there is no validity in the presumption that CO2 causes global temperatures to increase in any significant manner, they must be able to change and/or abolish the futility and expense for no return.

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

The climate change commission is not a democratically elected body and has no scientific standing other than that conveyed upon them by a political consensus, not a valid scientific authority as their premise is wrong.

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

per 1

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

A democratically elected Government should at all stages ensure it is listening to the people's concerns in a transparent systematic manner, even if the people's position is at odds with political aspirations of incumbent government.

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

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

Yes

Notes

With the caveat that the Climate Change Commissioners appointments must reflect equal numbers of scientific experts comprising climate alarmists and those who do not agree that man-made CO2 is a significant driver of natural climate change to ensure that real science is always present in any decision making which has economic ramifications.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

Natural climate change over a long period of time will have ramifications that should be properly evaluated by alarmist scientists and non-alarmist scientists. Sea level increases can be properly evaluated without the political and fraudulent science spin as exemplified by some quasi-scientists regarding sea level increases for some Pacific Islands, whereas they fully know that these particular Pacific islands are sinking into the sea due to numerous well-documented reasons. Natural increases in sea level rise are well accepted and are significant in certain topographical regions over relatively short-term periods (20-40 years), and in other areas over much longer time periods. There are well -documented reports of stable sea levels in many parts of the world, and instead of studying these to gain further real scientific knowledge, they are deliberately ignored by alarmist scientists. The fact that the earth's oceans are 1.332 Billion cubic kilometers in volume, and the vast majority of this volume below 1000m depth is really stable at around 2 degrees Celcius is never acknowledged by warmists. The average depth of our oceans is 3682 metres deep. 70 % of the earth's surface is covered by the oceans, and the extremely unscientific "sampling" of temperature points on land is deeply flawed across a number of scientific principles.

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

per 1 ; alarmist science has no standing, and there should be a transparent referendum before any of these radical economic steps are taken, with full disclosure of cost-benefit outcomes, including economic scenaria.

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

No, this pre-supposes that CO2 is a significant driver of natural climate change, which it is not.

Clause

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

Notes

I would like to see the New Zealand Government's open recognition that the world's climate has always changed, and that there is still no verifiable scientific proof that mankind has an ability to influence the normal climate change patterns to any significance. The climate has changed significantly in the geologically recent past, without mankind's inputs. Hence in the absence of scientifically verifiable proof that mankind can affect the earth's climate, spending trillions of Dollars to attain something which is fraught with uncertainty and many vested interest groups without a public referendum is premature. There are numerous examples of deliberate scientific fraud perpetrated to alarm ordinary citizens about climate change, for instance by alarmist proponents like Mr Al Gore. There is far too much alarmism which in many cases is driven by funding models that many scientists have come to rely on to pursue their interests. True science is never settled (<https://www.wsj.com/articles/climate-science-is-not-settled-1411143565>), and the vitriol by many of these alarmist scientists, such as the recently convicted fraudster Michael Mann of infamous hockey stick fraud, and Al Gore's "you can do this at home" fraud clearly show that real science is being stifled and denied. Name calling by alarmists does nothing to further true science, and labels like "climate denier" is a reflection of an inability to grasp the inconvenient reality that no scientist has ever claimed the climate doesn't change. Climate has always changed, and will continue to do so driven by elements completely out of the control of mankind. To name a few : The sun, the earth's orbital changes, volcanoes under the sea and above the sea, and catastrophic events like significant sized meteorite impacts. None of these can be influenced by any spending by any government. Instead of wasting trillions of Dollars on chasing ghosts, there ought to be a focus on expenditure which benefits mankind in significant areas such as health, food production, poverty alleviation, and peace.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.