

SUBMISSIONS ON The Zero Carbon Bill:

I strongly object to our government's proposal to introduce a zero Carbon Bill ... Here's why:

There are too many roadblocks, problems and issues. We must think again before committing our country to supporting 'The Global Warming' program.

It seems our ideologically driven Climate Change Minister James Shaw, is on a moral crusade to save the planet. But he seems to be blind to the economic harm his policies will inevitably cause.

There are many compelling reasons why I believe the Climate Change programme is flawed. I present some of these reasons to the committee:

1. Emotional hyperbole distorting the facts –

One early promoter of the theory of 'Climate Change' was the American politician, Al Gore. His movie 'An Inconvenient Truth' dramatically illustrated upcoming massive climatic disasters plus a 'hockey stick' temperature graph showing accelerating global warming. It was screened publically and in schools worldwide. Millions of people have been influenced and won to the cause of global warming by this well presented and emotive documentary.

His speeches were apocalyptic: "The North Polar ice cap is falling off a cliff," he said. 'It could be completely gone in summer in as little as seven years. Seven years from now.' Those comments came in 2007 as Mr Gore accepted the Nobel Peace Prize for his campaigning on climate change. But seven years after his warning, far from vanishing, the Arctic ice cap had expanded for the second year in succession – with a surge, depending on how you measure it, of between 43 and 63 per cent since 2012.

Further: Conflicting evidence of temperature changes proved his 'hockey stick graph' of upcoming global warming was also grossly exaggerated and has now been withdrawn.

There were too many conflicting issues in using the terms 'climate change' as you know this is now focusing on the issue of global warming.

The theory of global warming has been widely accepted by many around the world and has been picked up and pushed by radical Green parties in most Western nations.

2. However a significant number of the world's leading scientists are now challenging the findings, and scientific methods deployed by the 'Global Warming' group in producing their 'evidence for global warming.'

A staggering 30,000 of the world's best scientists have come forward declaring that man-made climate change is a hoax perpetuated by the elite for financial gain.

They state in science publications, 'The evidence presented by the global warming scientific group is often flawed, sometimes based on devious and misleading scientific processes.' Also: 'We cannot always trust the 'Scientific evidence' of Global Warming Advocates'.

Dr John Coleman, (founder of the weather channel), is one of these scientists. He warns that huge fortunes are being made by man-made climate change proponents such as Al Gore, who has made several millions of dollars.

He states, "Climate change proponents remain undeterred in their mission, ignoring numerous recent scientific findings indicating that there has been no warming trend at all for

nearly two decades. (*emphasis mine*) On top of those inconvenient truths, the White House has asserted that 97 percent of scientists agree that global warming is real. This statement has now been shown to be false and completely discredited.”

“Several independently-researched examinations of the literature used to support the “97 percent” statement found that the conclusions were cherry-picked and misleading. The authors deliberately presented a meaningless survey question so they could twist the responses to promote their own preconceived global warming alarmism.”

“These biased, misleading, and totally irrelevant ‘surveys’ have formed the best ‘evidence’ global warming alarmists could muster in the global warming debate. And this truly shows how embarrassingly feeble their alarmist theory really is.”

“And, of course, there are the more than 31,000 leading American scientists (to date) who have signed a petition challenging the climate change theory (*emphasis mine*) and 9,029 of them hold PhDs and are experts in their respective fields. But hey, Al Gore and his cronies have also ignored that inconvenient truth, as well.”

Global warming is caused by solar cycles and has nothing to do with carbon: Retired senior NASA atmospheric scientist John L. Casey revealed that solar cycles are largely responsible for causing the warming periods on Earth – not human activity. (*emphasis mine*)

Leading scientists decry the unscientific alarmism over “global warming: In their article in the *Wall Street Journal*, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming,” a group of sixteen world-renowned leading scientists decry the unscientific alarmism being promoted over “global warming,” citing numerous ‘inconvenient facts’ that dispute global warming claims:

“Global Warming Alarmist Liars: By using selected scientific information these clever deceivers, Global Warming Alarmists, build a false analysis of a complex scientific field. Most people with little or poor scientific education, are easily duped especially when emotion and patriotism are linked with phony science to produce a belief system of sorts. These liars are in actuality vicious and cruel in their crusade for money and power. If Al Gore was ever able to attain the global power he wants, he would be unrecognizable as the semi-inept benign Vice President he once portrayed to fool the people.”

Their message to policymakers:

“There is no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to ‘decarbonize’ the world’s economy. Even if one accepted the inflated climate forecasts of the IPCC, aggressive greenhouse-gas control policies are not justified economically. . Every candidate should support rational measures to protect and improve our environment, but it makes no sense at all to back expensive programs that divert resources from real needs to ones that are based on alarming and misleading claims of so called, ‘incontrovertible’ evidence.”

This statement follows up on the public resignation of Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever from the American Physical Society (APS) in which he states:

“I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with their [APS policy] statement: ”

The APS policy statement includes : ‘ ... The evidence for global warming is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth’s physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now. In the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible...’

“The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the much smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming ‘additional CO₂’ can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those

promoting alarm have now shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO₂.”

The Oregon Institute of medicine and science USA made the following statement:

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other later similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.

CO₂ is *not* a pollutant: (the Beacon Science Observer):

CO₂ is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO₂ that greenhouse operators often increase the CO₂ concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO₂ concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO₂ in the atmosphere.

3. Rather than simply stating the physical facts, the 'global warming' evidence presented has usually been accompanied by hyperbole and emotional videos aimed at swaying public opinion.

For instance; James Shaw announced the consultation on his Bill; using the following grossly exaggerated emotional forecasts. In spite of there being *no* real-life evidence that dangerous man-made global warming exists, James Shaw continues to attribute all manner of natural events to global warming:

“But the frequency and the severity of storms, coastal and river flooding, droughts and wildfires is increasing, and will continue to increase as long as we and the rest of the world keep putting greenhouse gas emissions into our atmosphere... Sea level rise alone puts at risk, five airports, 46 kilometres of railway, 1,100 kilometres of road and nearly 70,000 buildings, with a replacement cost of \$19 billion.”

His exaggerated claims have no basis in fact, and are no better than the sensationalist predictions from United Nations' climate models that have proven to be grossly inaccurate. For over twenty years - models used by former US Vice President Al Gore and the UN Environmental Programme to claim that 'sea level rise would engulf cities around the world and create 50 million climate refugees by 2010!' ... we note that this has not happened!

James Shaw is not only being dishonest with his fear-mongering predictions of gloom, he is also dishonest about the economic benefits of de-carbonisation, which he claims will provide “an extraordinary opportunity to upgrade our economy, not just to be 'clean and green', but also more productive and better paid”.

This is not true. Instead to the billions of dollars we would have to pay to the European funds and new restrictions on farming, we foresee many farmers losing their farms – more country towns disappearing – higher unemployment ... and a huge fall in government funding available for essential services such as; schools, hospitals, public works and helping the new

higher level of unemployment. If we commit our country to the global warming program The damage to our economy and to our country would be massive and completely unacceptable.

But rather than quantifying his so-called 'benefits', James Shaw refers to "the costs if we do nothing". The truth is there is no rational argument in support of his policy position. It's a policy built on fear.

James Shaw's 'clean' and 'green' economy doesn't exist - it's a false prophecy: Wind and solar power, which he heralds as 'the *clean green* saviours of the future', we are advised they depend on mining and smelting. A 3 metre wind turbine contains over 300 tonnes of steel, 5 tonnes of copper, 1200 tonnes of concrete, 3 tonnes of aluminium and 2 tonnes of rare earths - where mining one tonne of rare earths produces 200 cubic metres of acid waste water. Solar panels contain toxic elements; arsenic, aluminium, boron, cadmium, copper, gallium, indium, molybdenum, phosphorous, selenium, silica, silver, steel, tellurium, and titanium.

4. The fiddling with temperature data is the biggest science scandal ever: Their figures to prove global warming have been altered and jacked up artificially to try and prove their case.

"New data shows that the "vanishing" of polar ice is not the result of runaway global warming but hypothetical forecasting by global warming group. — Christopher Booker London Telegraph.

5. Current attempts to reduce greenhouse emissions have failed: California's obsession to introduce new sustainable energy has led to escalating power prices and massive power cuts.

Spain's love affair with renewable energy has also ended badly, failing to provide affordable power or security of supply, despite decades of government subsidies. These alternatives are just not working out as they were promised to.

6. To see the folly of 'clean green' policies, one needs look no further than the government's disgraceful decision to ban future oil and gas exploration. With domestic supplies of natural gas dwindling, and without the ability to discover new reserves - New Zealand's importation of natural gas from distant overseas markets will eventually lead to an overall increase in costs as well as emissions.

James Shaw wants to see 95 percent of cars and 50 percent of trucks electrified by 2050, but has yet to provide any details - including how New Zealand is expected to generate sufficient clean green energy to power all of the batteries. Will he force people to comply with his world view by raising the carbon levy on each litre of petrol from the present 4.7 cents to over 55cents, as predicted by the Productivity Commission – or will he do it by enormous increases on the annual registration levies on petrol and diesel vehicles? All this as our people likely struggle with a falling economy and rising unemployment.

7. There is no real-life evidence that 'dangerous man-made global warming' even exists. The weather events that James Shaw likes to highlight as being proof of runaway climate change are within normal bounds of historical natural variations. This applies also to a small rise in ocean levels (which again has been made grossly exaggerated by the green brigade.)

During the Warm Period of the medieval years, the earth was far warmer than it is today, and during the Little Ice Age, far cooler. Carbon dioxide levels have been far higher than now, and far lower. Species continue to evolve as they always have, with some dying out and others adapting and flourishing. Storms have been fiercer and more frequent than the present, as have floods and every other adverse weather events. The climate is chaotic, but no more, nor less, than it's ever been.

Carbon is essential to life on it and is not polluting:

Importantly; some are classing Carbon as “polluting.” But as every school child has been taught — the carbon cycle is an essential element for life on earth.

The actual level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is miniscule, but it plays an essential role in the food chain. All plants and animals (including humans) breathe in oxygen and breathe out carbon dioxide, but through photosynthesis in the presence of green chlorophyll and water, plants are able to capture the sun’s energy and carbon dioxide and store them as food, releasing oxygen in the process. This is the way it has always been.

Yet Green socialists, intent on destroying economic growth and prosperity, have convinced politicians around the world the lie that carbon dioxide is our enemy. CO2 is not our enemy – it is an essential element in the food chain for the survival of all living things. We must refute this lie.

8. A Wasteful Fraud Destined to Kill our Economy — Introducing this bill would bring disastrous financial costs of billions of dollars to our country at a time when there are so many unmet significant social and health needs desperately needing financial support.

The consultation documents accompanying the Bill show the policies come at a very high economic cost to all New Zealanders. Their modelling forecasts that by 2050, the economy would be at least a *quarter* smaller, and that the burden will fall disproportionately on lower income households.

Also that the output of ‘emissions-intensive’ industries such as sheep, beef, and dairy farming, will need to be halved.

Even if one accepts the outrageous, inflated climate forecasts of the IPCC, aggressive greenhouse-gas control policies cannot be justified economically. The costs of introducing this legislation into our country would be devastating to our economy:

The Costs to our farming industry: The farming industry has always been the backbone of New Zealand’s economy. However the second and third options of the Zero Carbon Bill are designed to target farmers. Environmental extremists want to see stock numbers reduced and farming limited as an economic activity.

Conversely soil scientist, Dr Doug Edmeades, explains:

“While most methane in New Zealand is produced by ruminants digesting food, it is *not* the problem the activists are making it out to be. (emphasis mine)

“Methane is short-lived in the atmosphere before it is converted to CO2. For every unit of carbon the animal emits as CH4 it must ingest the same amount of carbon from its plant-based feed source, which, comes initially from the CO2 in the atmosphere. The animal is both the source of the carbon in methane (CH4) and it is also the sink for the equivalent amount of carbon in CO2.”

“In this sense the carbon-methane cycle - methane-to-CO2-to-forage-plants-to-animals-to-methane - is a closed cycle. The animal is in fact CH4-carbon neutral.” (emphasis mine)

“Since livestock are carbon neutral, methane from agriculture must *not* be included in any emissions targets. Without methane, New Zealand would have one of the smallest greenhouse gas emissions profiles in the developed world.”

Dr Edmeades is right – and his finding illustrates only too clearly the reasons why ‘the climate science projections’ cannot be trusted.

In fact, no gases should be included in emissions targets, because just like the Emissions Trading Scheme, James Shaw’s proposed Zero Carbon Bill will create a exorbitantly expensive nightmare of red tape and bureaucracy with an enormous waste of time and money, destroy much of our farming industry, drag down the economy, and also destroy businesses and jobs, the lifeblood of our economy – all for no benefit.

We cannot and must not accept the global warming program — for the good of our country and also because it is based on misrepresentations and lies.

10. “We’ve been sold a hoax.” Not a single EU state is prepared to meet its climate targets”: ex-NASA GISS director James Hansen told the Guardian newspapers.

Here’s the real shocker: “According to a new analysis by the NGO ‘**Climate Action Network**’ CAN Europe, all EU countries are failing the Paris Agreement targets, as assessed by CAN Europe. It’s now crystal clear: Europe was never really serious about implementing the Paris Agreement from the very start. It was nothing more than a New Year’s resolution which no one ever intended to stick to.”

Little wonder ex-NASA GISS director James Hansen told the Guardian: “...the hoax today is perpetrated by those leaders claiming to be addressing the problem, but in fact are not.” Hansen is right.

The bullying and smear campaigns by the ‘Global warming’ establishment are outrageous:

Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists continues to grow, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of losing chances for promotion —or even losing their position.

They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the *Journal Climate Research*, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the ‘politically incorrect’ (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international Global warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr.de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr.de Freitas was able to keep his university job.

This bullying campaign is not only aimed at scientists, but also includes countries and their leaders who decide to not support the Paris agreement targets. We note how warmly they welcomed our new Prime Minister when she announced New Zealand would support these. On the other hand President Trump has been condemned and heavily criticized by the global warming club for pulling out of any commitments. I believe that President Trump made the right decision based on information he was given from his advisers who had been analyzing the global warming evidence.

Finally; The Labour/Greens Party’s Deception:

At no time during the election campaign did Labour or the Greens attempt to outline the full details of the wealth cost of their Carbon Zero policy. Even now, when the policy implications are being disclosed and the costs are becoming clear, they are continually down-playing the cost and instead claim benefits — when clearly there are none.

No party has the right to introduce policies to downgrade or destroy a country’s economic future without clearly spelling out their intentions and consequences during an election campaign.

The reality is that the ideologically driven Climate Change Minister James Shaw, is on a moral crusade to save the planet, and is blind to the economic damage his policies will inevitably cause to New Zealand.

The Green Party exists to find and create ecological disasters to justify their existence.

If we were looking to buy a house and we noticed that the piles supporting the house were rotting, plus it had a leaky roof and the cladding was falling off; we would be stupid to buy it.

These are the same reasons why we must not buy into supporting the low carbon and global warming movements. Their scientific foundations are unsound, there are large holes in their reasoning, and the cladding is falling off.

But more than this: global warming is a multibillion empire built on falsified scientific evidence that will consume billions of our dollars and leave us weaker and poorer for no benefits.

We notice that the New Zealand news agencies are very supportive of the global warming issues but have little or no coverage of the contrary opinions, issued by the world's top scientific community. This is most unfortunate and very misleading.

In the Light of all these reasons —

Considering: That the Zero carbon/global warming movement is built on false science reports and lies. The colossal amount of damage to our nation; excessive levies; loss of farms, loss of Kiwi jobs, higher taxes on essential fuels, loss of production and more companies likely to move out of New Zealand due to inflated costs and taxes.

I submit to you all —

we have a moral obligation to all New Zealanders: The Labour and the Green's Zero Carbon Bill must be blocked and rejected in the strongest possible way.

Yours sincerely,

— Denis W.Shuker, MPS(Chemist), BTh(hons), ANZIM.

Bibliography — Sources:

The US National Review.

The US Guardian newspaper.

Open source science solutions website.

The Oregon Institute of science and medicine reports.

The Right to Truth – news website.

Climate Action Network Reports (Wikipedia)

Natural News Network: the world's top news source on natural health.

Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature. John Cook^{1,2,3},

The Wall Street Journal.

The United Nations press releases on coral erosion.

The Beacon – Independent Institute.

The UK Daily Mail - global warming?

NZ Centre for Political Research.