

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 11490

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

The Government should not be setting a pointless target. Any reduction of CO2 emissions that NZ achieves will be negated many times over by the coal fired power stations built in China and India. On a global scale, NZ does not register.

Clause

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

Notes

No target necessary, see notes to Q1.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

N/A. No target necessary or appropriate. Setting a target is virtue signalling of the highest order.

Clause

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

Notes

It should not be enacted and, if enacted, it should be repealed at the first possible opportunity. The climate has been changing for millenia, human effects on climate change are trivial and the bias implicit in the climate change models has been proven by the lack of warming in the past 20 years.

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

There should be no stupid targets.

Clause

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

Notes

The next government should repeal any emissions budgets implemented by this coalition of fools.

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

The next government should repeal any emissions budgets implemented by this coalition of fools.

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

An emissions trading scheme is nothing more than a fool's plan for moving wealth from those who make things and do real work to those who do not. International transfers merely fill the pockets of corrupt rulers in the third world.

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

The fundamental basis of this bill has NO foundation in real science, so targets and emissions budgets are spurious.

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

Read some real science and get help from people who understand modelling. The climate scientists don't.

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

Waste of time. NZ should not have targets.

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. Disband it.

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

No such "expertise" is required as the Commission should not exist.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

The bill should not proceed.

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

It's all a waste of time and money based on a false premise and faulty "science". It will achieve nothing except imposition of additional costs on NZers who actually do things and produce stuff.

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

It's still a complete waste of time and money.

Clause

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

Notes

I do not consent to the release of my name and contact details on the website.