

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Jayne McGhee-Turnock

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?

1b. What is most important to you?

The balance between looking after the environment and looking after people. The contribution should be fair to both the environment and people.

Any and all financial, social and economic contributions should be balanced against all outcomes.

Should the cost of mitigation be negligible then there is no reason to not mitigate.

The more costly mitigation efforts are, the more (scientifically) sure we need to be, that: (a) a significant problem exists; (b) the mitigation efforts will produce the desired outcomes; (c) the medicine is not worse than the illness

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?

Lets suppose that all humans and human technology left NZ, ie zero CO2 emissions from mankind in NZ. The effect on global CO2 emissions would be immeasurable and the effect on global temperature even less so.

Now lets suppose that all humans and human technology left NZ and Australia, ie zero CO2 emissions from mankind in NZ and Australia. Even then, the effect on global CO2 emissions would be immeasurable and the effect on global temperature even less so.

Any and all efforts would be purely tokenism. A very, very expensive token. Most countries (such as China, India, Russia) would surely laugh at us behind closed doors, considering us fools. (Other than the other fools doing the same thing.)

There have been studies published (including at least one from the USA govt) where human emission contributions are in the range of 3% - 5%. (There is also a study that suggests that worldwide termites contribute more CO2 than man kind.)

A fair contribution would therefore, have to be No Target, No Contribution to CO2 reduction at this time. Put those costs onto research and development of suitable replacements to fossil fuels - the sooner the better. Also put those costs into provable and pragmatic environmental programmes - local climates can be affected by local activities. For example, Mt Kilimanjaro's snow and ice was reduced due to deforestation, and has now improved due to reforestation.

An important fact that many seem to miss: Only a prosperous economy can afford to look after its environment properly.

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



Copy of your submission

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?

No contribution - PRO - a more prosperous economy would help the vast majority of NZers and NZs environment.

- Neutral - as demonstrated above there will be no change to global CO2

- CON - verbal grief from the warmist Nazis (I use that phrase due to the tactics they employ which follow in the steps of the early days of Nazism)

Any contribution - PRO - less grief from the warmist Nazis - they always want more

- Neutral - as demonstrated above there will be no change to global CO2

- CON - the greater the contribution the more handbrakes are applied to the economy, the poorer NZ will be financially.

- This will cost lives; when NZ's poor cannot afford to provide sufficient basics of good food and sufficient warmth, their health will deteriorate.

- More people will afford less and become vulnerable to health issues and crime issues. These costs lively hoods and lives is huge, and from what I

have seen these effects have been grossly understated or ignored.

- The poorer NZ is the less able we are to defend ourselves in the face of aggressors. Aggressors such as the fanatical Islamists. They are a fast growing threat and they will not stop until they are dead or they have the whole world back in the dark ages under strict Islam law. They don't care about the environment in any way.

How do you reduce household consumption? Most of us are as efficient as we can be, without sitting in a cold dark house doing nothing.

The only way is to provide efficient cheap electricity. Using large coal, etc, powered generators with the modern scrubbers ensuring pollutants don't escape into the environment. (CO2 itself is not an environmental toxin - plants can't get enough of it.)

Without cheap and reliable electricity people will and do turn to other sources of energy, eg, gas, wood, coal, etc, for heating and cooking. These sources provide more pollutants.

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?

I sincerely hope the Govt will see sense. No self harm, please. This is very important. Stand up against those bullies.

In the short term - no reduction on CO2 emissions,

- reduce actual toxic emissions as much as possible and practical

We (humanity & NZ) should work on developing reliable and cheap alternative energy sources. This requires the financial where with all from economies that are flourishing so that such costly research can be completed.

In the long term - we would no longer rely on fossil fuels to provide us with our energy needs because we have developed new reliable energy sources to provide cheap energy to the populations of the world.

Summary

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

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



Copy of your submission

target?

Set no target. this is the only sensible option.

The future by its very nature is uncertain. We can only base probabilities on what has been - until we fully understand how and why a something occurs.

What is certain is that our current scientific knowledge is very limited. Our knowledge of the climate's very complex web of interactions is very limited. For example: our understanding of what causes El Nino and La Nina is limited to a few theories. As the current El Nino demonstrates we can only base the measure what is happening with what has happened. The current El Nino has not has a usual lead in. This is one of several oscillations that are observations of world climatic events. There is little or no scientific understanding as to why they happen. These oscillations are annual to multi-decadal. We don't understand them, let alone longer time scale variances.

What is certain is that we don't understand natural global variations in climate, let alone well enough to understand any effects man may have on the global climate.

What is certain is that our current technologies cannot provide reliable, cheap and eco-friendly alternatives to fossil fuels. (Eco-friendly includes production and decommissioning.)

- windmills are costly, inefficient and unreliable. They also kill a lot of birds. Many business around the world have been prosecuted for accidentally kills a few bird but these windmills are allowed to kill birds by the hundreds??
- solar power is unreliable in locations that have frequent cloudy days.

Have no target, do not impose costs onto the economy and instead encourage the economy to grow; encourage research and development to find better ways to produce electrical energy for the population.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.

We don't know nearly enough (scientifically) to put any programme of any kind in place. This requires a lot more research. - please encourage climate research without biased outcomes.

Carbon credit/charge systems could never and will never achieve the official aim of reducing CO2 output.

People need to be warm. People need to eat. People need jobs. Businesses needs cheap energy to produce items that people can afford, to employ people.

To provide only expensive energy when cheap is available is negligent at best, if not criminal.

There is no win for the country. There is no win for people. There is no win for businesses. There is no win for the environment. So who wins??