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**Clause 1.** What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?  
**Notes**  
Government should not reduce CO2.

**Clause 2.** If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?  
**Notes**  
Government should not reduce CO2.

**Clause 3.** How should New Zealand meet its targets?  
**Position**  
Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)  
**Notes**

**Clause 4.** Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?  
**Position**  
Yes  
**Notes**  
If it is shown that "global warming" is not directly caused by CO2, Government should have the ability to amend any "global warming" and subsequent CO2 reduction legislation. If the underlying cause is faulty, the legislation is faulty.

**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**  
NZ has a small economy. Using taxpayers money to fight something that has not been successfully proven will hurt the economy, the taxpayer, and eventually cause government instability.

**Clause 6.** Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?  
**Position**  
Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence  
**Notes**  
As noted in Q4 - If the underlying cause of the proposed legislation is found to be faulty, government must have the ability to change any part of it. Faulty reasoning underpinning legislation will cause that legislation to eventually fail.

**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  
**Position**  
Yes  
**Notes**  
As noted in Q4 and Q6.

**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
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 underlying "facts" about climate change are not facts at all. The vast consensus of actual climate scientists is that CO2 has no effect on climate. This negates the whole reason for this legislation.

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
Dr. Tim Ball, originally of Canada, is one of the most level-headed climate researchers, and actually addresses the science behind "climate change". He concludes that pre-industrial levels were not actually 280ppm, as widely claimed, but as high as 550ppm. He also states that climate "science" is a non-falsifiable discipline, which makes it not scientific. If you can't disprove it, how can you prove it is true? You can't. http://drtimball.com/2013/why-and-how-the-ipcc-demonized-co2-with-manufactured-information/ CO2 is a beneficial, harmless trace gas that is critical for life on Earth. All life will become extinct at levels below 150ppm. In addition, climate sensitivity to CO2 (as measured in a lab, not in real life) shows that as CO2 doubles, there is an inverse logarithmic correlation with temperature rise. i.e. we can emit any amount of CO2 and the temperature will only mildly rise, reaching an absolute maximum of around 1.5C higher than present. This will not boil the oceans or cause icecaps to melt, nor runaway warming to develop. The entire reasoning behind NZ government's ideological drive to tax more, is faulty.

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
The Climate Change Commission, as with all ideologically driven pressure groups, is going to be made up of government-approved panelists. History shows that these will not include any nay-sayers, or skeptics, despite there being ample evidence that the whole thing is a scam. For this reason alone, the panel will be biased, and their decisions will not be impartial.

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. The CCC should not exist, ideally. Unless it has actual scientists who can hold an un-biased opinion.

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
The only qualified candidates should be those who understand the fundamentals of the actual science behind so-called climate change. Not those who already have shown allegiance to one side or the other. Picking opinionated scientists is a contradiction in terms. Scientists have to look at data impartially, rather than show allegiance to an ideology. Otherwise, they are just priests, not scientists.

Clause
14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?
Position
No
Notes
Less taxation will lead to a more prosperous economy. NZ is about the only developed country that has no overtime laws, primarily due to its small economy. Taxing people more will not increase the economy.

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
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
The less money that is required to be spent (and required from the NZ taxpayer) the better for the economy.

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

Notes
The NZ economy is small, and fragile. NZ has no overtime laws as they were seen as detrimental to the economy (which in fact, they aren't, but that's a different story). Obviously, the economy is of critical importance to all NZ-ers. Raising taxes will not help anyone, except the government. But rule no.1 of economies is that they perform better with smaller governments! So, lower taxes mean more money for the people. More money for the people means more taxes, which helps the government. But it doesn't work the other way around. In addition, NZ already has a “brain-drain”, whereby all the brightest minds and hardest workers leave the country for Australia or beyond, as they can far outearn their NZ career opportunities by doing so. This has led to a shortage of skilled professionals in various areas, something that the government has been well aware of for many years (enough to put in place procedures for attracting such professionals). By taxing people yet more, for an unproven science is tantamount to economic suicide. I urge the government to scrap these plans immediately, and put all the money that would be spent on it, into ways of improving the economy, first and foremost.