

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 10453

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

First, consider the role of carbon dioxide in relation to life as we know it - oxygen, photosynthesis etc. It is an essential trace gas.

Clause

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

Notes

The current level at 0.043% is fine. The actual level is sufficiently above the minimum level of carbon dioxide where photosynthesis ceases to function (at 0.020%). At the level of 0.020% or approximately half the current atmospheric level, life and the environment as we know it on this planet would cease to exist. Nature balances this trace gas.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

The natural mitigations of emissions in NZ, and worldwide, as they are now, work well. This is proven in the measurement of our GHGs and relativity to populations here and worldwide.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Otherwise, if the pathway chosen is wrong, restrictive and misdirected legislation may not allow rapid rectification. However I do not see the need for a Zero Carbon Bill

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

Disagree, unless consideration is given to the actual data which indicates these proposals are political and not factual science based.

Clause

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

Notes

Any and all budgets if instigated should be reviewed with actual data from scientific monitoring. That is the role of budgets. Any budget that is not constructed with measured and actual data - (not assumptions or modelling) should not be considered.

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

All budgets if instigated must be reviewable. The wording of this question would indicate a manipulated and closed question submission form leading to questions about the outcome objective of the designer of this form.

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

It is essential the Govt and CCC take all factual data into considerations, not assumptions. Please refer to my response above.

Clause

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

Notes

It is essential to consider the effects of reductions of CO2, an essential trace element gas. At 0.02% all photosynthesis ceases.

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 most important issue is to recognise that the IPCC has not been able to answer a specific question I have posed to their secretariat which would indicate something is seriously wrong in this matter. The format of this particular form has been clearly set to indicate a pre determined outcome, which is clearly anti democratic and a concern for any New Zealander. I have never struck anything like this before. It is a sad commentary on the organisation who instigated approved this process.

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

Notes

Unless the proposed CCC has some democratic balance, it should have no say whatsoever.

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

An ETS is a nonsense. Actual carbon dioxide concentrations prove that there are natural fully mitigating factors in place

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

Yes. That would be a good start! Essential that critical analysis of factual data be kept to the fore.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

If climate change is caused by other factors, why would a Zero Carbon Bill cover climate change.

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

Notes

p47 relatively non specific. We have to expect climate change, that is the norm. As populations grow it makes no sense to allow development in risk areas. This issue is quite separate from a political endeavour to promote a single and unproven "cause" of climate change.

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

Simply put, this is an attempt at unbridled political power and control. We live in a democracy. Again I am shocked at the nature and restriction of questions in this form. I request that I be contacted at sometime to be able to discuss this with someone on the commission. I have endeavoured to enter a table of factual data which I feel will not reproduce correctly and is important to the submission I am making.

Clause

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

Notes

I am a retired farmer from Cambridge. I wish to make a submission to the Our Climate, Your Say consultation on the Zero Carbo bill. As a farmer, and like my fellow farmers, I have had a lifetime interest in climate and its changes. It had, and has, a major influence on my occupation and the profitability of our enterprise. My interest in the subject of climate and climate change intensified from the period where it was indicated that agriculture was responsible for 48% of the GHG emissions in New Zealand. How so, and why? I started my research by contacting a scientist who was present and involved in the Kyoto negotiations, Richard Christie, Executive Director of the South Island Dairying Development Centre. As a farmer, I was frustrated by the fact that under IPCC rules, no mitigating factors are considered in the protocols New Zealand agreed to at Kyoto. The difficulty was, according to Richard Christie, that it would have been difficult to establish those protocols, particularly in relation to New Zealand agriculture, in the negotiations. Richard's final comment in his email to me was the telling one - "Those negotiations seem to have much more to do with politics than (sic) they do with saving the planet". I was to later challenge Prof Jacqui Rowarth of Waikato University at a public meeting as she spoke of the need for agriculture to prepare to meet commitments in GHG reductions. I later discussed the issue at length with Jacqui. To my amazement I discovered that Jacqui had no knowledge of the actual proportions of the atmosphere carbon dioxide and methane represented, nor was she aware of these gases being measured and recorded here in New Zealand since 1960, nor carbon dioxide's minute annual increments (see table below). In New Zealand atmospheric gases are monitored and measured by our Ministry of the Environment at Baring Head, in Wellington. When I advised Jacqui that carbon dioxide was 0.043% of the atmosphere, a mere trace gas, and vital for the survival of life as we know it on this planet, in astonishment Jacqui exclaimed - "OMG!" I was stunned by Jacqui's reaction. In disbelief she asked me if what I said was true. I advised Jacqui to check the information out herself. She later did. I still wonder how many of the advocates for reductions in carbon dioxide know this fact. To clarify - that is one four hundred and thirtieth of one percent of the atmosphere! Halve that amount of carbon dioxide to 0.02%, and all life as we know it will cease to exist. Photosynthesis stops at this level! Carbon dioxide, a trace gas, is the building block of life as we know it, our environment, our food, our oxygen. It is essential to life. Despite what some would promote, our atmosphere is not wash with this gas. It is measured and monitored. 1850 126,888,000 1,114,558,000 ATMOSPHERIC CO2 INCREMENT ANNUALLY 1.5-1.6 ppm/Yr 1.5-1.6 ppm/Yr

Year	Co2 Atmospheric Percentage
1850	0.0425%
1960	0.0360%
2012	0.0430%

WORLDWIDE MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS Nil

The interesting observation of the tabled data - factual and recorded - is that there appears to be very little relationship with the combustion engine and the actual atmospheric content of carbon dioxide. There was a drop indicated in the 1960 figure which could correlate to the quiet industrial period of 15 years following World War Two, suggesting minute increments as a result of human activity. In preparation to put my submission into writing I emailed the advertised email address on the Consultation website with the following request on the 25th June: "Could someone on the Climate Change Team please supply me with a reference, or references, to the specific and conclusive peer reviewed research that directly attributes and clearly demonstrates scientifically, that atmospheric carbon dioxide, and the reduction of this gas from its present level at approximately 0.043% of the atmosphere will directly and conclusively change the world's climate to the exclusion of all other potential causes. I would also be interested to know, to what level should this gas be reduced to satisfy a "Zero Carbon" policy." Being advised after a follow up that the matter was being worked on, I was eventually directed to an IPCC 5th Assessment Report and told "This report represents the global scientific consensus on climate change, which the New Zealand Government accepts." Simply, the Climate Change Consultation team were unable to specifically answer my request, not that I fully expected the team to be able to provide that answer or answers. So why would a government accept that assessment? How much research has it carried out? I then elected to contact the secretariat of IPCC in Geneva and made the same request. Mxolisi Shongwe of the IPCC Secretariat finally responded. Again, I was presented with two website links outlining the Assessment report 5, Chapter 10 wherein I was promised I would find my answer. I was faced with a raft of modelling and assessments in a report spanning. The reports did not answer the specific information I requested. I was confronted with an elaborate raft of IPCC assessments all of which in some form or another endeavour to "fingerprint" changes in temperature and link them to GHG's. The most common term used by all the authors was 'likely' or 'most likely'. Much, if not all of the data published was either presumptions or forced modelling. There was no established and demonstrated fact showing clear and proven links that the miniscule actual and measured increment of a trace gas, carbon dioxide, in any way, was capable of being a major cause of climate change. Analysing the actual data in the table above, and assuming the consensus of contributors to the IPCC case was that the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide was the source of global climate change, this would actually mean that from 1960 when the above records were made by the Ministry of the Environment to the 2012 level and beyond, a span of 52 years and beyond - an increase of atmospheric carbon dioxide by 16.28% of one four hundred and thirtieth of 1% of this trace gas is causing global climate change. Little wonder that the IPCC secretariat was unable to answer my question! So where from here? Nowhere in the official IPCC literature did I find any mention of, or reference to, a known and significant natural cause of climate change., the Milankovitch orbital variations. Following study, the National Research Council of the US National Academy of Sciences has embraced the Milankovitch Cycle Model ...orbital variations remain the most thoroughly examined mechanism of climatic change on time scales of tens of thousands of years and are by far the clearest case of a direct effect of changing insolation on the lower atmosphere of Earth (National Research Council, 1982). Orbital variations of the planet, ie. changes in orbital eccentricity affect the earth-sun distance. Currently, a difference of only 3% (5 million kilometres) exists between closest approach (perihelion), which occurs on or about 3 January, and furthest departure (aphelion), which occurs on or about 4 July. The other is variation in Axial Obliquity. The change in the tilt of the earth's axis (obliquity) effects the magnitude of seasonal change. At higher tilts the seasons are more extreme, and at lower tilts they are milder. The current tilt according to NASA is 23.5 degrees nearing its highest tilt. We are currently observing apparently greater extremes in climate which would be consistent with the above known facts In summary • There is no such thing as normal when we consider climate. • A change in climate - which, forever changes - is to be expected. That we, living on a planet hurtling through space at 36,000 mph, and expect it to fly a precise orbit is nonsense. • The world is growing in population, we live in a time of instant communication and graphic video of what is occurring. If I had had a modern cell phone in the 1950's I could have recorded flooding on our own property that has never occurred since. The result of that flood instigated the Waikato River Flood protection scheme, dissipating these events in a managed way. My video from one particular "cloud burst" would have flashed across the world like what we see occasionally today. It was spectacular. As our communities and population grow, worldwide and here, there are places that just should not exist as and where they are. For example, Edgecumbe in the Bay of Plenty will flood again. It is built alongside a river with a huge catchment on a flood plain. Whanganui is similar. The world is embarking on change such as electric vehicles and the management of the environment and resources. That is good. Our resources are finite. To believe that Carbon

Dioxide is the cause of climate change, simply beggars belief when one considers fact rather than hypothetical modelling. I understand the difficulty of having to meet obligations previously entered, however I would rather see New Zealand take a measured and thoroughly critiqued approach to "the scientific consensus" of the IPCC Assessment Reports which show its authors and contributors qualitative level of confidence from very low (more predominantly) to very high (seldom). As Richard Christie said, "This has much more to do with politics than they do with saving the planet" Therefore, I pose my question directly to the Climate Change Public consultancy and to the Government which accepts this "scientific" consensus, and that is simply: Either the Government or the Climate Change Team please supply me (and the New Zealand public) with a reference, or references, to the specific and conclusive peer reviewed research that directly attributes and clearly demonstrates scientifically, that atmospheric carbon dioxide, and the reduction of this gas from its present level at approximately 0.043% of the atmosphere will directly and conclusively change the world's climate to the exclusion of all other potential causes. I expect, and demand a specific, conclusive answer that would justify the economic cost of current solutions that are being promoted. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this directly with the commission if it were possible.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.

Supporting documents from your Submission

Climate_Change_Submission_Script.pdf

Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 02:44PM