

# Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Ross Fletcher

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

I come from a position that a slightly warmer world with more CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere will be a vastly better environment for mankind with more food being grown and increased longevity. Increasing green/food growth worldwide for food requirements is needed for an ever increasing population. The best method that is showing great results is the increased levels of CO<sub>2</sub> worldwide. Your issue is a non event in my opinion, as you are confusing GHGs (95+% water with a few trace gases) with pollution and with CO<sub>2</sub>. CO<sub>2</sub> is a building block for all things green in the world and has little or no discernible effect on global warming. The ideal level of CO<sub>2</sub>, if we were able to control it, would be between 1500 and 2000 ppm (the ideal level of CO<sub>2</sub> to promote the best growth). The current ratio of man made CO<sub>2</sub> molecules in the atmosphere is 1:89000 and you are considering attacking the 1. Good luck to you.

What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

2. What do you think the nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means for the level of target that we set?

No restrictions on CO<sub>2</sub> will mean NZ's emissions will remain paltry by world standards and our NZ food growers will be able to meet the burgeoning demand for food into the future. Any restriction on GHGs will be an own goal and place NZ in a straight-jacket for future ability to grow.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

Your questions get worse. This is not about NZ's consumption. The poor of the world need increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions via fossil fuels (please note not GHG emissions) to develop from subsistence living into modern economies. Once the people of Africa, Asia, Sth America, etc. have electricity, clean water, good health, they then may focus on CO<sub>2</sub> levels if they ever prove to be a problem.

4. Of the opportunities for New Zealand to reduce its emissions (as outlined on page 15 of the discussion document), which do you think are the most likely to occur, or be most important for New Zealand?

This debate will be driven on a global stage by the likes of India, China, and the other large developing nations. China has already said that they will think about controlling their CO<sub>2</sub> levels after 2030 (this is meaningless). India and others have all said something similar. NZ should not consider attending this UN sponsored forum as the only thing to gain would be to appease green activists and every possibility we could lose our sovereignty to allow other

# Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

---

countries to determine our economic growth or demise. I am upset that the recent comments emanating from UN that declare environmental issues are the hook to look to increased UN powers and that the capitalist world needs changing have been seen as acceptable by the MSM.

## Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?

We have ignored science (IPCC policy papers are written by politicians not scientists) so how would we expect anyone to start really getting together with technologies and costs? Future technologies will no doubt become available to solve most of the problems of the world as has been proved to-date with almost every major indicator showing great improvements completely against the hysterical forecasting of the Green activists' movements. We now have more natural resources, cheaper energy, almost unlimited fossil fuels, available food, improving health and far less deaths from natural disasters. What is the problem that needs solving????

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.  
Government should disband all groups working on AGW and GHG until the science has caught up with empirical evidence and real science is resumed as opposed to computer based models that have never been accurate. My suggestion is do nothing and have another look in, say, 25 years. There has been no temperature increase (by UN numbers) for the last 20 odd years. This again is against horrific predictions by our Green activists. Will we still be addressing this problem if we move into another little ice-age as is being widely predicted but very poorly reported?