

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Rosalie Ashby

## Reference no: 11673

**Submitter Type:** Individual

### Clause

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

### Notes

Please see the notes below under "any more comments you wish to make" thank you.

### Clause

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

### Notes

I believe - as do many other well-read, intelligent, highly educated and researching individuals ( world wide) , that reducing carbon emissions can make no more than a miniscule impact on global temperatures. I fear that the promotion of this theory has been so widespread and intense, coupled with the fact that it is an impossibly complex matter results in the fact that MOST people accept the mantra- so often stated, that "the science is settled". I am not critical as it is outside most people's time or abilities to fully research the matter. Other supporters are so fully entrenched in the matter that they do not dare to extricate themselves, or cannot, or will not allow any questions. I am aware of decades of emotional debate, and I know that many scientists have resigned, been refused promotion, or restricted in many ways so they cannot share their viewpoints, and certainly not able to publish in scientific publications. Many of the public believe those who question are selfishly self-seeking but I know this is often not the case. I believe New Zealand to be a fine leader with opportunities to lead in other areas. I am sorry but this is the only way I can say it. Please see extra comments below. Thank you.

### 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

Commissioners must have an open attitude to the likelihood that restricting carbon dioxide emissions will have NO impact on global temperature. Co-benefits of some measures hopefully will include the reduction of all types of pollution.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

Ability to adapt is always important.

### 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

Yes I believe that Climate is changing and the government should have mitigating plans in place. Sea level rises will continue at a slow and steady rate so some protection has to be given in certain places, eg Tamaki Drive in Auckland. It is also important that the government consider the possibility of cooling temperatures which could happen quite rapidly - although unlikely.

### 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

Yes

### Notes

### Clause

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

## Notes

Thank you yes. I am very keen to make comment as I do hope my attitude - beliefs will be recorded. I have done months of close study on this subject. I have studied, equally, both "sides" of the debate. I used to be a secondary school teacher, now retired, which is why I am able to take this time. I used to teach the topic "Climate Change". I have read the IPCC reports plus the recent "Climate updates. What have we learned since the IPCC 5th assessment report". I understand the reports and I understand why all the information is so extremely persuasive. I believe that the opposing ideas from the scientific (and other) communities is not published. I believe that while climate is changing - of course, as it always has, that this is NOT caused by carbon dioxide which is one of the lesser of the GHGs.. CO2 is a boon to our planet Earth. Climate warming rate is not unprecedented, we are emerging from a 300 year warming period but in the last 18 years climate warming has slowed and the rate does not correspond with the increase in CO2 which has been rising since the 1850s. For 80% of its existence Earth has been warmer than today. Other climate forces have often overridden the warming effect of CO2 and Greenhouse gases. Man's input to climate warming through carbon emissions is miniscule. The very best explanation for this widely held point of view is in an excellent book which although written by a scientist, Howard Thomas Brady, is fairly accessible to a lay person. Those who hold the prevailing and therefore widely publicised Government and academic viewpoint of worrying manmade global warming have not read this book. It is the only very recent full discussion of every aspect of the complexity of the multi-cyclical climate systems (described in science as "chaotic") and it explains all aspects of the over-simplicity of the IPCC's thesis. This I find most disturbing. I am completely neutral with no position to protect but I am totally dismayed to realise that it is impossible to get any "opposing" view published or heard. For this reason I believe our Government is about to embark on a most complex "revolution" based on a totally incorrect simplistic premise - that of man-made carbon emissions causing global warming. I totally support all efforts to improve the state of our Earth - any action that improves the water, soil, ocean, air quality etc - ie pollution is totally to be applauded. I believe the other 127 nations who signed the Paris accord are also being misled by the IPCC. I believe most people are innocent of the deceptions and truly believe they can "see" the effects of (manmade) warming and the graphs showing increasing CO2 since 1850 are most persuasive and beguiling. Usually part of the "silent majority", and following months of intense and honest study on this subject I am very insistent that my point of view - which is not uncommon, be registered. Unfortunately very few people are able to undertake this level of personal research as they are genuinely too busy or insufficiently educated and therefore only too willing to believe "what the science community" is appearing to say. Therefore NZ should NOT be a leader in this charade but use our worthy and considerable influence and our precious funds in other directions - pure research and education and of course the development of alternative fuel/power sources. Thank you for the opportunity - I do hope this reaches some objective ears.