

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 11763

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

I'm not sure if anyone really cares. I'm only responding because it is unusual for these questions to be asked. But human influenced climate change is a hoax. It is a very easily proven unscientific scam. If someone genuinely cares to know why, I may be contacted via email... although I genuinely do not expect that to happen. But if you truly care for the welfare of your country and citizens, you will not allow yourselves to be victimized by this global fraud.

Clause

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

Notes

CO2 is not a pollutant, or problematic in any way. It is a healthful trace natural substance that is necessary for life on this planet. This scam is literally a tax on breathing.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Forestation is always advisable.

Clause

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

Notes

The majority of life as we know it is carbon based. Therefore "zero carbon" is an ill-advised goal... unless the intent is sterilization.

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

This is a waste of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

Clause

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

Notes

This is a waste of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

This is a waste of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

Notes

This is a waste of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

Clause

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

Notes

This is a wast of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

I suggest you be as well informed as possible when it comes to the welfare and stewardship for your people.

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

This is a wast of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

This is a wast of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

Expertise is always advisable. Competent personnel with a basic understanding of science (such as physics, thermodynamics and chemistry) WHO ARE NOT AFRAID TO BE OBJECTIVE is what's called for.

Clause

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

Notes

This is a wast of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

This is a wast of your money, that I'd expect could and should be used in other ways.

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

Anthropogenic global warming is NOT a real threat.

Clause

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

Notes

The complicity to this scam runs VERY deep. The statements I've made are ones I know to be fact from personal experience and I've no political or other agenda beyond preserving and disseminating scientific Truth. Many others are aware of this fraud and have attempted to speak out. One notable person was the sadly late Professor Robert M. Carter. I never knew of him before he passed, but found he explained the truth of all this better than I or most others can. But perhaps the best lead to a convenient concentration of competent scientific comment would be the United States Senate Minority Report where beginning in 2008 more than 650 scientists went on record to speak out against this fraud. It is available at:

https://www.hatch.senate.gov/public/_files/USSenateEPWMinorityReport.pdf and if anyone sincerely desires the truth to all this, I suggest they begin by reading it.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.

Supporting documents from your Submission

USSenateEPWMinorityReport.pdf

Uploaded on 07/19/2018 at 12:23AM