

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Alastair Gibson, **Alastair James Gibson**

## Reference no: 11974

**Submitter Type:** Individual

### Clause

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

### Notes

No specific target should be set.

### Clause

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

### Notes

Again should not be set by legislation.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Measures should be domestic only. Sending money overseas to 'offset' emissions is an example of the mindless policies which have become part of this whole issue.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

When people start looking at what the science actually says rather than the rhetoric that comes from activist scientists, NGOs with their own agenda and a superficial media interested only in click-bait, they will realise that the majority of this 'problem' is overhyped. A reasonable response would then be to not set random targets but to focus on improving and preserving the environment and investing in technology to achieve the same end.

### 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

As above.

### 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

For reasons outlined above.

### 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 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

**Position**

No

**Notes**

According to some 'the debate is over'. It clearly isn't. Yes CO2 is rising, yes CO2 is a greenhouse gas and all else being equal temps will rise. The debate is how much and what the effects will be. I believe that on the basis of what the science does say, the answer is 'not much' and there will be benefits as well as harmful effects. But on a scale of things there are much more important problems, environmental and social to be focused on.

**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**

As above.

**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**

No budget, therefore no plan. Instead focus on the real environmental issues. Reduce, reuse and recycle because they are the right things to do. If AGW is the focus then bad legislation will happen. Eg. rainforest clearance and other habitat destruction to grow palm oil to meet the demand for biodiesel.

**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**

I have serious concerns about the make up of this commission. There needs to be an acknowledgement that a significant sector of the scientific world do not support the alarmist stance which is behind this proposed legislation.

**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**

Depends on make up of commission but suspect they should have no role in anything.

**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**

Need representation from both sides of the debate.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Climate change is 'normal' whatever the drivers. We need strategies regardless.

**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**

Yes

**Notes**

With the proviso that the alarmist predictions are almost certainly wrong and that our ability to predict climate or any other change is

extremely limited. We should focus on current problems and the future will take care of itself.

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

As outlined above. We need to step back and look objectively at the evidence. So much of the alarmism is based on computer modelling with incomplete knowledge of the factors controlling climate. Their predictions from earlier modelling have proved wrong time and time again. To take but one example where the science does not match the rhetoric... we are told that we are experiencing more extreme weather events than before due to AGW. The science including the latest IPCC report says there is no evidence of such things yet. There is a whole book written by an IPCC lead author and who is an expert specifically on extreme weather events who in an attempt to give some scientific integrity to the whole debate, says very clearly that we are not experiencing more extreme events. The only changes are people with cell phones to provide footage, a media currently obsessed with the topic and the fact that there is more infrastructure in harm' way. When a spotlight is put on every so-called disastrous aspect of climate change, the scale of the problem melts away. There is 5% reason for concern and 95% hype that unfortunately detracts from other real problems. I gen the format of this submissions axion does not invite any questioning of the assumptions underlying the bill. It's taken as a given that AGW is a pending disaster. Why aren't countries responding more aggressively to the problem? Maybe it's because that despite the public rhetoric they realise the hat the science is far from settled.