

# Submission on Zero Carbon Bill

Richard Treadgold  
Convenor, Climate Conversation Group  
19 July 2018

I have operated the Climate Conversation Group blog ([climateconversation.org.nz](http://climateconversation.org.nz)) and studied global warming for 13 years.

Western democracies have a long tradition of scientific study of policy issues before responding to them. In fact, our Cabinet Rules require an assessment of costs and benefits so as to select the most efficacious policies at a reasonable price.

But we are given no explanation of why we need the Zero Carbon Bill, what effect it will have, nor how much it could cost us. The bill apparently will not stop global warming: it will simply be a good example to other countries for we know not how much money.

## Extraordinary disregard of science

This is repugnant virtue-signalling, a horrendous use of taxes and an abominable disregard of science. Climate science is far from “settled” and actually embroiled in vigorous scientific disputes in numerous areas of disagreement, which an even-minded person may discover in a few minutes. This evasion of a discussion of the science will outrage New Zealanders.

Examples of disputed climate science include the accuracy of surface temperature records, the effect of clouds on temperature, the equilibrium climate sensitivity to carbon dioxide, the influence of the sun, the effect of intergalactic cosmic rays on incoming solar radiation, the global warming potential of minor atmospheric gases (including methane), and the course over the next 80 years of human activity, any of which might seriously influence the risks we face and the policies we adopt.

In addition, myths and misunderstandings are embedded in public climate discourse, as follows.

## There’s no evidence for a dangerous human influence

Sea level rise is not accelerating.

Neither the frequency nor the intensity of hurricanes, tornadoes and droughts is increasing.

The Royal Society of New Zealand does not seem to believe that human activity is causing dangerous warming, for they produced no evidence for it recently even when pressed.

The most powerful greenhouse gas is not carbon dioxide but water vapour, as long acknowledged by the IPCC.

The influence of water vapour overwhelms that of CO<sub>2</sub> due to evaporation, condensation into clouds that shade the earth and rain that cools the air, thus naturally regulating the earth's temperature.

Carbon dioxide cannot dangerously warm the earth, as it's a minor gas, constituting an inconceivably small 0.0004 of the atmosphere and absorbing energy in just a tiny portion of the infrared spectrum. Note that CO<sub>2</sub> has risen 9% in the last 20 years without raising temperatures.

For some reason the IPCC does not mention in its reports hundreds of papers confirming a solar influence on climate (see [NoTricksZone](#)).

The government’s basic failure to confirm evidence of a hazard before committing the country to substantial expense and disruption to mitigate that hazard is reprehensible. Reason demands that before proceeding with the bill it absolutely must be supported with clear scientific evidence.

Thank you.

Richard Treadgold  
Convenor  
Climate Conversation Group