

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Murray Grainger

Reference no: 11721

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

There is no need at all to set any emissions reduction target ever.

Clause

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

Notes

CO2 is the plant food that feeds the NZ economy (agriculture, silviculture, aquaculture, horticulture and the scenery that brings tourists to our Great Walks etc) Why on earth would we want to deprive our economy of its feedstock. Talk about biting the hand that feeds you. Utter madness to reduce CO2 at all.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

There should never be a target to meet, it is folly to think that anything done in NZ about CO2 can change anything in the climate. Even if CO2 were controlling the climate, and that has never been proved, the amount from NZ is so miniscule that it would make absolutely no difference if we never emitted another molecule of CO2 from tomorrow on.

Clause

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

Notes

See above. No CO2 targets ever then there is no need to revise something which was never put in place

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?

Notes

NZ emissions are a drop in the CO2 ocean. Again, no proof exists that CO2 emitted from NZ can or would affect the climate so no budgets required so no revisions required.

Clause

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

Notes

See above - no budgets required so no revisions required.

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

See above - no budgets required so no revisions required.

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

Yes

Notes

Because every decision made that moves towards the inanely named "Zero Carbon" goal will have a negative impact on: • economic circumstances and the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy • fiscal circumstances • social circumstances and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on fuel poverty • energy policy and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on energy

supplies and energy security. Look at the damage already done by Jacinda's "captain's call" to wreck the Taranaki economy and run the country out of natural gas within 10 years.

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

See above. There is absolutely no need to budget carbon dioxide. It is the food that our economy depends on.

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

Cancel any climate commission. Cancel any "Zero Carbon" bills. Stop wittering on about climate change. It is an entirely natural phenomenon that has been happening for millennia and will continue to happen long after we are all gone. Mankind cannot change the climate one way or another and it is arrogant to think that we can and especially to think that NZ has some effect on the globe.

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

A climate commission is a grand waste of taxpayer funds. Do not establish. Do not fund.

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

Cancel the ETS as well.

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

There should be no climate change commissioners - a huge waste of taxpayer funds. You suggest expertise in • climate change policy - Writing a policy will not affect the climate • resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution) - all will be negatively impacted by any emission reduction targets • te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests - oh, for crying out loud, what on earth has the Treaty got to do with the climate? • climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori. - Had to look that one up: Mātauranga Māori; 'the knowledge, comprehension, or understanding of everything visible and invisible existing in the universe'. Are you seriously suggesting that Maori have a developed tradition of dealing with climate change? If Maori understand everything visible and invisible existing in the universe then they will know the answer to climate change. Job done! • business competitiveness - there will not be any business competitiveness if emission targets are imposed.

Clause

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

Notes

There can be no such thing a "Zero Carbon" each one of you reading this submission is 18% carbon. Are you going to zero yourself out of existence to ensure "Zero" carbon? A "zero carbon bill" is an exercise in futility and stupidity.

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

See above. A waste of taxpayer funds

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?

Notes

See above. A waste of taxpayer funds

Clause

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

Notes

Before any attempt is made to address climate "change" we must, as a nation, agree on what exactly the climate is that we do not want to change and in which direction it should not change? If we stop all the CO2 and somehow get the 'climate' back to the pre-industrial 1800s is that not changing the climate (back)? Or is climate change only bad if it is in a certain direction (warmer)? If this is the case, why don't those who propose climate change commissions and so forth be honest and say so? Surely it is not because there hasn't been any warming for the last twenty years or so? And would, say, one degree of warming in one climate zone, say Southland, have the same effect as one degree of warming in another, say Northland? If climate 'change' is bad, how do you know if you are stopping climate change unless a baseline 'acceptable climate' has first been agreed upon? Without the complete data on this agreed perfect climate that we do not want to change any decisions made are going to be flawed. If you don't know your starting point, you have no idea if you are making progress towards your destination. Once we agree on the description of New Zealand's ideal climate from which any change is unacceptable, we can start some sensible discussions.