

Submission to Ministry for the Environment

Author: Brian Hughes

Email:

Our Climate Your Say: Consultation on the Zero Carbon Bill. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.

I do not support the introduction of the Zero Carbon Bill (ZCB).

The option of an, “I do not support the introduction of a Zero Carbon Bill” tick box provided on the official response form to the ZCB would more adequately have enabled the general public to truly “Have their say”. This was denied them.

Obviously, any consultation on the Zero Carbon Bill was only to take place within the carefully constructed guidelines of the “Have Your Say” questionnaire and the governments own preferred agenda. This appears to be non negotiable and heavily influenced by the politically manipulated unscientific pronouncements of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and The Paris Climate Accord. Both groups promote the view summarised as; scientists agree and their consensus is, the science is unquestionably settled proving human induced climate change is definitely occurring and is the result of increasing levels of greenhouse gases of which carbon dioxide is the major contributor.¹

Recently attending a DairyNZ Climate Change Roadshow promotional day for the ZCB in Rotorua, I was disappointed at the level of scientific bias presented in its support.

It is my opinion that it **would not** at all be in the best interests of New Zealand or New Zealanders to establish a Climate Change Commission under the guidelines proposed, whether in an advisory capacity only or, one which possesses powers to enact decisions it deems necessary. This latter option is very dangerous.

I desire and would very much appreciate an opportunity to speak before any available and applicable government committee set up to consider the adoption of the Zero Carbon Bill.

Some relevant reasons for not adopting the Zero Carbon Bill are:

- 1) Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant.

¹... that ‘the science is not settled at all’ and that it is most premature to make a far-reaching agreement, as was done in Paris. When the future reveals that it is not manmade CO2 but the natural system that is the principal climate-driving force, society will be very unforgiving to the scientific community, and they will be right to be so. Professor Guss Berkhout, Climate Thinking: Broadening the Horizons p3. Emeritus professor in physics and seismic imaging at Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands.
https://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2018/06/Berkhout.pdf?utm_source=CCNet%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=ca97fc8ac7-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_06_11_02_56&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fe4b2f45ef-ca97fc8ac7-20157989

- 2) Scientifically, the “greenhouse effect” does not initiate a constant irreversible rise in both the earth’s surface and atmospheric temperatures.² Temperature rises before CO2 levels rise.
- 3) Carbon Dioxide is not a “long life” greenhouse gas. Its “residence time span” is only 5-6 years, not 1000-10,000 years as promoted by DairyNZ and Discussion Document p22.³
- 4) Carbon dioxide is fundamental to the process of photosynthesis.
- 5) Atmospheric Carbon dioxide promotes growth and life, not decay and death.
- 6) Present levels of CO2 (>400ppm) are well below optimum levels.⁴
- 7) CO2 levels of 180ppm plants become greatly stressed. At <120ppm everything dies.⁵
- 8) IPCC computer climate modelling does not include Tropospheric measurements and analysis because, it is impossible to predict or determine. Modelling, therefore, is inherently flawed and untrustworthy.⁶
- 9) Scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change is neither factual nor scientific. Rather, it is an overtly political globalist agenda intent on wealth redistribution.⁷
- 10) The wisdom of attempting to alter climatic behaviour is problematic and ill advised.⁸
- 11) The earth has ‘greened’ 50% more over the last 35 years due to elevated CO2 levels according to NASA.⁹

² <http://drtimball.com/2013/a-basic-and-powerful-analysis-of-greenhouse-effect-fallacies>

³ <https://www.youtube.com/embed/BC1l4geSTP8>

⁴ “The optimum level of CO2 for plant growth is about 5 times higher, 2000 ppm, yet the alarmists warn it is already too high. They must be challenged every day by every person who knows the truth in this matter. CO2 is the giver of life and we should celebrate CO2 rather than denigrate it as is the fashion today.” Dr Patrick Moore, <https://www.thegwpc.com/28155>

⁵ <http://drtimball.com/2011/co2-insanity-kill-the-plants-kill-the-people>

⁶ <http://drtimball.com/2012/static-climate-models-in-a-virtually-unknown-dynamic-atmosphere>

<http://drtimball.com/2015/validation-of-a-climate-model-is-mandatory-the-invaluable-work-of-dr-vincent-gray>

⁷ <https://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/environment/item/22841-what-s-the-real-agenda-behind-climate-change-alarmism> “From 2008 to 2015 Dr. Edenhofer was co-chair of the UN

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change working group on "Mitigation of Climate Change." He is also deputy director and chief economist of the [Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research](https://www.potsdaminstitute.org/) in Germany, one of the climate centers helping write climate policy for the EU, the UN, and the World Bank, and one of the most-cited sources on climate in the mainstream media. During an interview in 2010, Dr. Edenhofer candidly declared, “One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with the environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole.” And, he added this shocking admission: “We redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy.”

⁸ <http://drtimball.com/2018/the-biggest-deception-in-the-human-caused-global-warming-deception>

⁹ <https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/2016/carbon-dioxide-fertilization-greening-earth>

- 12) Since 1990 the world has actually experienced a reduction in severe weather events worldwide; the USA experiencing a decrease of 20% since 1900.¹⁰
- 13) Volcanic activity contributes to melting of Antarctic Ice sheet.¹¹
- 14) Global sea ice increase in 12 months of 1 million square km at 28/6/2018.¹²
- 15) Global Warming theory is not matching what is actually observed scientifically. According to Professor Humlum, "It is clear that temperatures in the troposphere are continuing to diverge from surface temperatures. In other words, they are warming more slowly than global warming theory says they should. The contrast with theory is even more marked in the stratosphere, where temperatures have barely changed for 23 years. We still have much to learn about the climate."¹³
- 16) Anthropogenic Global Warming/Climate Change is a human fabrication of a nonexistent problem. Similar historic examples of fabrication include: (1) Thomas Robert Malthus's hypothesis (1798 – *An Essay on the Principle of Population*) that population increase inevitably implies increased poverty and famine, however, through human innovation optimism existed for the future, (2) Professor Paul R. Ehrlich in his 1968 book "*Population Bomb*" forecast again a Malthusian future with calamitous consequences and proposed the introduction of drastic totalitarian remedies, including, compulsory birth control, adding sterilants to water supplies and deliberate starvation of non compliant populations, (3) John P. Holdren co-authored with Paul R. and Anne H. Ehrlich the 1977 book, "*Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment*", which argued for a totalitarian solution of enforced abortions, mass sterilization, and a "Planetary Regime" with the power of life and death over citizens of the world. John Holdren was from January 2009 to January 2017 the senior advisor to President [Barack Obama](#) on science and technology issues through his roles as Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, Director of the White House [Office of Science and Technology Policy](#), and Co-Chair of the [President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology](#) .

¹⁰ <https://riskfrontiers.com/weather-related-natural-disasters-should-we-be-concerned-about-a-reversion-to-the-mean> . <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2017/08/why-houston-flooding-isnt-a-sign-of-climate-change>

¹¹ https://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=295861&org=NSF&from=news&utm_source=CCNet+Newsletter&utm_campaign=77ee4f19bf-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_06_29_04_04&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fe4b2f45ef-77ee4f19bf-36436917

¹² https://sunshinehours.net/2018/06/26/sea-ice-extent-global-antarctic-and-arctic-day-176-2018/?utm_source=CCNet+Newsletter&utm_campaign=77ee4f19bf-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_06_29_04_04&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fe4b2f45ef-77ee4f19bf-36436917

¹³ https://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2018/03/State-of-the-Climate2017.pdf?utm_source=CCNet+Newsletter&utm_campaign=c36dd09ff1-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_03_27&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fe4b2f45ef-c36dd09ff1

In summary, I submit that it is not necessary for New Zealand to adopt mitigation methods for the purpose of instigating a low emissions economy for the reasons stated by Government and the Zero Carbon Bill. The ramifications of adopting such a policy are inherently negative and restrictive upon the people of this nation and its future economy.

According to Former Australian Prime Minister and now MP Tony Abbott 50% of the worlds emissions are contributed by China 28%, America 15% and India 7%. As he points out in a recent speech neither China nor India have signed up to the Paris accord and America has pulled out altogether. Australia contributes a puny 1.3 percent. Europe contributes 11% to the overall emissions telly and so Tony Abbott advocates,

“Of the four biggest emitters, China and India have made no Paris commitment to reduce their total emissions and America has now pulled out – so when three of the four biggest emitters have no Paris reduction target at all, why should we – especially now that we can start to count the cost...in more expensive cars and in culled herds as well as through more expensive and less reliable power? Knowing what we know now, we would not have made the Paris agreement. Now that we do know, we should get out of it.”¹⁴

Based on Tony Abbott’s reasoning above and New Zealand’s own puny 0.17% contribution to the worlds total emissions telly, I think it is rather arrogant and to even consider introducing policy through the Zero Carbon Bill.

When three of the four largest contributing nations that make up 50% of the world’s total anthropogenic emissions want nothing to do with international conventions on climate change for whatever reasons, isn’t it time for New Zealand to take a more humble approach and realise that perhaps there is more than just trading market perceptions and politics that need to be considered here?

New Zealanders need to seriously ask themselves:

What is really driving the urgency to adopt emissions policy?

Who really is driving this policy and for what reasons?

Is the evidence given in support of proposed emissions policy credible and consensual as is so often stated?

Do we really understand how climate works in order to make correct and safe decisions concerning its management?

Who has been shut out of this conversation since day one?

Why has there been no real public conversation about anthropogenic climate change, but rather instead an organisational totalitarian propagation and enforcement of its ideology?

These are questions that still require legitimate public discussion and answers!

¹⁴ <http://tonyabbott.com.au/2018/07/2018-bob-carter-commemorative-lecture-australian-environment-foundation-melbourne/>

