



# Submissions form

We seek your feedback on the specific proposals in the Zero Carbon Bill.

Either email this submission to [ZCB.Submissions@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:ZCB.Submissions@mfe.govt.nz) (Microsoft Word document (2003 or later) or PDF) or post to Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington, 6143.

## Publishing and releasing submissions

All or part of any written submission (including names of submitters) may be published on the Ministry for the Environment's website, [www.mfe.govt.nz](http://www.mfe.govt.nz). Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, the Ministry will consider that you have consented to website posting of both your submission and your name.

Contents of submissions may be released to the public under the Official Information Act 1982 following requests to the Ministry for the Environment (including via email). Please advise if you have any objection to the release of any information contained in a submission, including commercially sensitive information, and in particular which part(s) you consider should be withheld, together with the reason(s) for withholding the information. We will take into account all such objections when responding to requests for copies of, and information on, submissions to this document under the Official Information Act.

The Privacy Act 1993 applies certain principles about the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals by various agencies, including the Ministry for the Environment. It governs access by individuals to information about themselves held by agencies. Any personal information you supply to the Ministry in the course of making a submission will be used by the Ministry only in relation to the matters covered by this document. Please clearly indicate in your submission if you do not wish your name to be included in any summary of submissions that the Ministry may publish.

## Personal / organisation details

*You must provide either a company name or given name(s)*

Company name \_\_\_\_\_

Given names Murray \_\_\_\_\_

Surname Lane \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Submitter type, pick one:

- Individual**
- NGO
- Business / Industry
- Local Government
- Central Government
- Iwi / Māori
- University
- Research Institute
- School
- Community Group
- Unspecified / Other

## 2050 target

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

Pick one:

- the Government sets a 2050 target in legislation now
- the Government sets a goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century, and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later.

### Optional comment

**No target should be set.** There is no justification for any action on so called climate change. Global warming is NOT occurring

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

Pick one:

- net zero carbon dioxide:** Reducing net carbon dioxide emissions to zero by 2050
- net zero long-lived gases and stabilised short-lived gases:** Long-lived gases to net zero by 2050, while also stabilising short-lived gases
- net zero emissions:** Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050.

### Optional comment

The target to set, should be based on economic growth of the country. Any reduction in energy use, or increase in cost of energy will reduce the living

standards of New Zealanders. The world is NOT at risk of catastrophic climate change caused by human activity.

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Pick one:

- domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)
- domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting) and using some emissions reductions from overseas (international carbon units) that have strong environmental safeguards.

**Optional comment**

**There should be NO limits set on Carbon Dioxide emissions. Planting forests should be justified by the economic return based on close analysis, or erosion control, or aesthetic values.**

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

Pick one:

- yes
- no.

**Optional comment**

**Any government ruling should be able to be revised as circumstances change. Again NO target should be set for 2050**

## Emissions budgets

5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (ie, covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?

Pick one:

- yes
- no.

**Optional comment**

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

Pick one:

- yes, each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence
- yes, the third emissions budget should be able to be changed, but only when the subsequent budget is set
- no, emissions budgets should not be able to be changed.

**Optional comment**

An inappropriate question. There is NO need to be setting any emissions targets. If the ruling becomes law, Governments HAVE TO HAVE an opportunity to rescind that law.

7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under [exceptional circumstances](#)?

Pick one:

- yes
- no.

**Optional comment**

As with answer to Q 6. No emissions targets should be set.

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?

Pick one:

- yes
- no.

**Optional comment**

There is NO NEED to set emission targets

## Government response

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

Pick one:

yes

no.

**Optional comment**

There is NO NEED for carbondioxide emissions targets. CO2 is a colourless, odourless trace gas, that is essential for ALL life on earth. It is essentially airborne plant fertiliser, without which ALL plants will die. The current level of 410 ppm in the atmosphere is not high enough. Ideally it would be between 1000 – 1500 ppm. During the last ice age (only 20,000 years ago) atmospheric CO2 dropped to 170 ppm. Plants starve / die at 150 ppm. The lift of CO2 concentration from the early industrial revolution of 280 ppm to todays 410 ppm, can be thanked for a 15% increase in crop productivity.

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?

**Comment**

You need to move away from the “group think” that prevails in Wellington.

There is NO justification for any emissions targets for NZ. Any sacrifice we make in achieving our goals, will be picked up by emissions from other countries.

Follow the lead of the President Trump administration. They have a rational view of this issue. Real Science from NON governmental scientists have shown clearly that the modelled data bares no relation to ACTUAL data over the last 25 years. The 20 year “pause” in global warming is a major embarrassment. As were the Climategate emails from climate scientists at East Anglia university. The hoax is a misuse of public funds, and completely undermines the trust we have in our government.

Take a hint from the fiasco that is happening in South Australia with 40% green energy - power prices are the highest in the world, and almost the most unreliable... How does a modern economy operate efficiently with intermittent energy. What happens is businesses move out... Employment falls... Government income from taxes decline... the nation heads in the direction of Venezuela.

## Climate Change Commission

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?

Pick one:

yes

no.

**Optional comment**

There should be NO emissions goals set. There is NO NEED for the money to be spent on the Climate Change Commission. That we have Government that thinks it can control the climate by taxing us and spending to reduce productivity is ridiculous.

12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Pick one:

- advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS
- makes decisions itself, in respect of the number of units available in the NZ ETS.

**Optional comment**

There should be NO NZ ETS.

There should be NO Climate Change Commission

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?

Pick one:

yes

no.

**Optional comment**

Climate researchers are affected by group think.

There should be NO climate change commissioners.

## Adapting to the impacts of climate change

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

Pick one:

- yes  
 no

### Optional comment

The climate has always changed... The very bad ice age that “peaked” 20,000 years ago was the fifth recurring cooling period of approximately 90,000 years long, interspersed with 10,000 year long warm periods (Today's = Holocene; The last one 100,000 years ago = Eemian). Over the last 3000 years of the Holocene we have had a cooling climate. The Minoan warm period 3000 years ago was warmer than today. The Roman warm period was cooler than the Minoan, but warmer than today, as was the Medieval warm period 1000 years ago, warmer than today. Any climate change that happens, is NOT happening because of human activities.

Hence, the OBVIOUS solution to any change of climate is to adapt to it. Eg Wear more clothes when the climate cools, build breakwaters if the oceans threaten, as the Dutch did, built stronger houses with modern (energy intensive) technology as we do, not like energy poor countries that build houses out of thatch.

We rely on the NZ government make the right decisions to ensure that energy is both plentiful and cheap for the NZ standard of living to be maintained.

15. The Government has proposed a number of new [functions](#) to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?

Pick one:

- yes  
 no.

### Optional comment

Other than what could be called “adapt”, know other functions are required. Oceans have been rising at 1.77mm/year for the last 150 years. There has effectively been NO change, hence NO need for the government regulate.

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?

Pick one:

- yes  
 no.

**Optional comment**

It will lead to a prolific growth in the number of organisations trying to access money from what ever pool is set up.

Everyones story will have to be worse than others to get the money... It will lead to a fiasco.

**AGAIN, HUMANS ARE NOT AFFECTING THE CLIMATE, THERE IS NO NEED TO TAX US, TO SET UP ETS's TO REDUCE EMISSIONS – WAKE UP TO THE HOAX.**



Climate Change is a hoax.

This submission is to protest that the NZ Government is spending or planning to spend, any of our money on “combatting” what used to be called “Global Warming”.

Other than data from climate models there is no data to suggest that “Anthropogenic Catastrophic Global Warming” is occurring, requiring large amounts of funding to address, and likely to put a cap on the very thing that has built this amazingly healthy dynamic society that we live in.

One hundred years ago there were almost no vehicles in NZ, and we were only just discovering the power of oil and coal. Think what life was like then and compare it to now... The difference is driven by cheap energy. Cheap Energy that means a machine can do for us, what used to be done by a large number of low paid people and animals (horses).

As I have done before, I challenge the NZ Government to come up with factual observations that the world is warming catastrophically because of human activity. Glaciers were melting prior to the industrial revolution. Sea level rise was 30mm/year 10,000 years ago (as the earth moved out of the little ice age), and now is a worrying, non-accelerating annual rise of between 1.5 – 2.0 mm/year.

The Vostok ice cores from Antarctica clearly show that CO<sup>2</sup> levels in the atmosphere increase after a lag of 700-800 years after the warming has occurred.

Brian Leyland has summarised the issue very well below...

### **Local Government New Zealand leads on global warming**

Posted on [July 1, 2018](#)

By [Bryan Leyland](#)

Local Government New Zealand have embarked on a “Climate Change Project” focused on adapting and mitigating “climate change” – properly described as man-made global warming.

When faced with a potential risk, the rational approach is to make sure that the risk is real, assess its magnitude, decide if anything needs to be done, and if so, what is the cheapest and most effective solution.

In spite of the fact that no one has any convincing evidence based on observations that man-made global warming real and dangerous LGNZ have jumped to the conclusion that the risk is real, urgent action is needed and lots of our money and resources must be spent on “fighting climate change”. Taking an objective look at all the evidence never even crossed their minds.

If they had looked at the evidence, they would have got a big surprise.

They would have discovered that world temperatures have increased by about half the predicted amount over the last 20 years and New Zealand has hardly warmed it all. This would – or should – tell them that the computer models which the climate scientists rely upon for predicting future climate are worthless. There is nothing abnormal about the modest amount of warming that has occurred as we recover from the Little Ice Age.

They would also discover that sea level rise in New Zealand – and the rest of the world – has been steady at between 1.5 and 2 mm per year for the last hundred years and shows no sign of the claimed recent rapid increase. They would also discover that there is no reason – other than the failed climate models – to assume that it will rise more rapidly in the future.

If they studied storms, floods and droughts in New Zealand and the rest of the world they would find that recent weather is rather better than it was in the past. The IPCC agrees.

If they looked at the history of atoll formation they would realise that coral atolls were able to keep up with a sea level rise of 3000 mm per century at the end of the ice age. It follows that they cannot be in danger from the current tiny rate of sea level rise. Pacific islands do have real problems, but they are not caused by sea level rise.

If they looked further they would discover that there are many very credible papers based on observations and experiments that indicate a very high probability that the world will soon enter a cooling cycle. Right now sunspot levels are lower than they have been since the Little Ice Age and the correlation between sunspot levels and temperatures is very strong.

A Danish professor has established a cause and effect relationship between sunspot cycles, cosmic rays, low clouds and global temperatures. When sunspot levels are low, the magnetic shield emitted by the sun is low and this allows more high energy cosmic rays to reach lower levels in the atmosphere. When they do, they cause condensation and this triggers cloud formation. Other scientists have analysed past climate cycles and concluded that there is a high risk of global cooling.

While they regard carbon dioxide as a dangerous pollutant, without it, life on earth could not exist. The reality is that it is essential to life and plant growth and the recent rise in concentration has increased agricultural productivity by about 15%. A big win for New Zealand's economy..

They might also be interested to discover that neither the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the Royal Society of New Zealand nor Prof Jim Renwick can provide convincing evidence based on observations of the real world that man-made greenhouse gases cause dangerous global warming. The evidence simply does not exist. Until this evidence is discovered – if it ever is – the only rational conclusion is that man-made global warming is, in all probability, the biggest hoax in the history of the world.

It is tragic that Local Government New Zealand have bought into the global warming hoax.

We should not be squandering our money and damaging our economy in a futile attempt to solve a problem that, according to the evidence, does not exist.

Well stated Brian.

Regards  
Murray Lane