

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Jo Hampton

Reference no: 12171

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Clause

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

Notes

The government should study recent and established scientific evidence showing that CO2 levels rise FOLLOWING temperature increases. Temperatures have risen and fallen due to natural cycling through millennia evidenced by ice cores. While environmental targets for clean air and water are to be applauded, it is unfortunate that those behind this bill prefer to ignore good environmental husbandry, which is easy to achieve, in favour of unachievable targets that will do nothing to improve air and water.

Clause

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

Notes

The best target for NZ is one that enables the population to develop technology that will improve the living standards of all people and ensure proper management of land, sea and air. Unfortunately each of these options will do nothing but plunge humanity into poverty and suffering with increased deaths due to the approaching solar minimum and attendant global cooling. Seen the temps in Australia this winter? That's just the start.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

You may wish to note that while China, a signatory to the Paris Accord, has increased emissions, the US which has just pulled out, has managed to decrease emissions recently. Perhaps we should find out how the US achieved this and copy them. With falling temperatures that we are seeing now, this will automatically lead to lower CO2 levels which in turn weakens forests and leads to increased fires. Decreasing CO2 weakens plant life - is this really what you want?

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Because scientists already know that 2050 will be much cooler than today due to solar variance. Politically biased greenies don't understand science.

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

I would prefer to see effective, achievable programmes for clean air and water. This has nothing to do with 'emissions' which is an utterly meaningless term. How are you going to stop a volcano from emitting its gasses?

Clause

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

Notes

When the public wake up and realise that the global warming agenda was a scam, the government will topple if it doesn't address this factor. Perhaps that would be a good thing, given the pathetic performance we see in NZ today.

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

Yes - the government should be free to make decisions based on reality. When snow is falling in Auckland, JAFAs are going to ask why the authorities are refusing to allow people to have a fire to keep warm. If you don't respond to this you will lose power.

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

Not sure why Maori concerns are different from all other New Zealanders when it comes to global warming.

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

I would prefer taxpayer resources be spent on clean air and water programmes, not a carbon trading scam for rich people. Sick.

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

Consultation should be with the electorate, not NGOs and special interest groups.

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 would prefer we sent a person to the USA and find out how they are doing so well on environmental programmes.

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

The scheme is a get-rich rort for the rich. Guess how Al Gore made his billions - his own carbon trading schemes. Greenies are being used. Wake up guys

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

No need for Maori input - surely we are all in this together. Need more business input - if businesses fail, no jobs. Greens don't understand that. And no, a UBI is not a good thing.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

There needs to be an ability to respond to sudden cooling as we have seen in Australia. We have growing glaciers, more ice than ever in the Arctic, Antarctic and Greenland. More icebergs. We already seeing crop losses around the world due to cold, rain and hail as a result of changes in solar radiance and yet we are completely unprepared.

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

Fails to prepare for approaching cold period.

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

Yes

Notes

So long as it monitors global cooling and crop losses.

Clause

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

Notes

Very sad to see huge amounts of money being used to boost a profitable scam while the real danger to humanity is global cooling. Scientists are predicting mass starvation and yet failing completely to put in place programmes to protect our most vulnerable people from environmental destruction. We bow to the UN despite the fact that their commands, followed blindly by our government, will lead to suffering of the most vulnerable in society.