

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Kevin Fewtrell

Reference no: 11867

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

There should be no target as the science is not proven and you can't set a target for something that is not quantifiable.

Clause

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

Notes

As above. A target is not quantifiable as the science is not settled.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

As we are less than 1% of global emissions there should be no targets.

Clause

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

Notes

Again there should be no targets.

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

No. There is no evidence that taking money off of NZ Taxpayers will affect in any way Climate Change or global warming. It is a natural occurring phenomena.

Clause

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

Notes

There is no need for a budget of any kind.

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

No. As Above.

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

There should be no considerations as there should be no budget for Climate Change. NZ Citizens come first not some virtue signalling drivel from the Paris Accords which is a failed exercise.

Clause

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

Notes

There should be NO Emissions Budgets. It is a sham.

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

Putting NZ Citizens first. Not a virtue signalling exercise in which the Biggest Polluters are not signatories to and have no intention of becoming. Why hurt NZer's for absolutely no reason other than as a sop to the Green Party.

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

No. It is a waste of a \$Billion dollars annually that is better spent in NZ.

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 it is not needed.

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

It will become another bureaucracy peopled by troughers on another gravy train.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

It is a natural event that has been continuously happening since the planet formed. It is a needless Bill/Legislation.

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

There is nothing the Govt can do that will change anything except to hurt Taxpayers needlessly.

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

No

Notes

There is no need as this Bill and supporting infrastructure is not needed. The science is not settled.

Clause

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

Notes

This is nothing more than a Virtue Signalling exercise that will do more harm to NZ Taxpayers in lost revenues (\$1Billion Annually to start) than if that money was kept in NZ and spent here. It is nothing more than a sop to the NZ Green Party in a minority Government that would sell NZ Taxpayers down the river to stay in power. A disgrace. The Zero Carbon Bill should be abandoned forthwith. It is meaningless.