

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 2:35:57 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 10:25:24 am

Dear Commissioners,

I wish for New Zealand to withdraw from the United Nations and their nefarious New World Order plan using the guise of climate control.

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning, which is one world government ideologies.

The people of New Zealand do not wish to be associated with this agenda as we are a country that holds Christian values and beliefs, and not the beliefs of the New World Order, One World Government, Globalists, Elites, and Satanic cults.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 2:16:56 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:16:20 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:55:29 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:18:16 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:48:42 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:35:49 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:38:44 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:58:54 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:25:27 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 9:16:49 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:06:43 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:48:49 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 7:06:52 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:36:01 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:55:17 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:06:32 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:58:42 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:16:06 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:58:39 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:45:09 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 8:17:03 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:55:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's latest proposal.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Thus there is no good reason the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:55:19 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:35:42 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – **likely in the hundreds of billions** – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this **untransparent consultation process** is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 9:35:57 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:25:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:45:11 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:18:52 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

My reasons for opposing this are

1. We the public have not been allowed to look in detail at the commission's analysis, it is fundamentally arrogant and wrong that the commission does not allow scrutiny of its recommendations.
2. From what I have managed to research, the commission has not evaluated the costs and implications of its recommendations. This is flawed, there are always unintended consequences and costs associated with any policy decision, by having a narrow brief, without cost and community implications any conclusions will be open to poor decisions.

I have high hopes for this current government to make some real differences to our nation, this plan and some other recent uninformed decisions is making me reconsider my support.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: 
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:38:46 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:38:42 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:45:12 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 9:18:45 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 7:28:43 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 5:15:55 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 11:45:26 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:55:23 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:48:45 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:28:44 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:07:02 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 2:06:52 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:38:42 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:06:41 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:55:14 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:28:53 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:25:14 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:58:54 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:25:15 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:55:32 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:25:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders. I am concerned how these changes will affect the lower income earners of New Zealand, how are they going to be able to afford these changes? Electric cars? The inability to use natural gas as a source of heating? How are they going to afford power?

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

There is very little within this policy that discusses how and what will happen with all these vehicles that will need replacing?

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 2:58:27 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:06:58 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:59:00 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:16:40 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:17:22 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:58:40 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:36:05 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:45:26 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:59:00 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:25:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:45:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:36:04 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:07:02 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 8:48:42 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:55:16 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 5:15:47 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 4:15:40 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:38:44 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning. The jury is still out regarding the claim that man-made CO2 is a significant driver of Climate Change.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

New Zealand should be concentrating on reducing pollution emitted from all forms of fossil fuel combustion and in particular ICE vehicles. Presently there are no exhaust emission checks done on ICE vehicles during the WOF annual test.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 1:55:24 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 8:45:28 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 11:16:49 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 5:17:13 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 10:41:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:06:30 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 2:16:54 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 7:35:57 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:55:25 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:16:02 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,+

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:18:55 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:36:02 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:48:42 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 12:58:41 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:28:32 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Albany

Auckland

From: 
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:35:54 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 5:58:57 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:25:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:55:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:48:44 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:55:21 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Auckland

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:55:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 6:09:38 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:45:13 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:09:21 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:09:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:55:18 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:58:46 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:45:29 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:48:43 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:16:19 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:36:20 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:55:21 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 2:19:19 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:25:46 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:45:26 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 5:16:41 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:36:00 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning without thought or care for so many low income New Zealanders.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

The Commission doesn't seem to have given any regard to the impact its recommendations will have on the lives of the people it says it's saving by making these changes. New Zealand is already well on a path to zero carbon emissions while other much bigger countries continue to pollute.

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

The Commission has not taken into consideration the cost of its recommendations to the poor of this country and sadly, I'm one of them.

I had a brain stem stroke in 2014 and my husband of 18 years didn't want a bar of me so I was replaced before I got out of hospital.

I will never be able to change to an electric car, yet I will be constantly penalised for it.

I have a gas hob on my oven - I will never be able to afford to change it. There is no capacity to save on the Supported Living Benefit.

I am disabled so there won't be any walking or biking for me. At present I can barely stand for more than 5 minutes.

There's no bus service that can take that into account. Your recommendations ignore the needs of the elderly, the disabled, those on a fixed income and the Beneficiaries. It also ignores those on a low income who are the working poor.

As such, I believe they breach my Human Rights.

From your ivory tower, do you ever consider us....or are we just necessary collateral damage?

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:25:38 am

Dear Commissioners,

I, Les Mellars oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:25:36 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:06:36 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:55:20 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:45:25 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:36:04 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:38:41 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:16:05 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:25:24 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:45:16 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:18:38 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:28:31 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 7:25:31 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 9:36:07 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:15:49 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:45:28 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning, more so than the current government is already undertaking.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:06:32 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:06:39 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:38:38 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:18:40 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:18:40 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:58:43 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 12:36:05 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

As a [REDACTED] climate assessor when folk were considering planting vineyards and orchards in [REDACTED] Otago to take advantage of tourists travelling to Queenstown, I find most of your Base Measurements very dubious. Exotic crops were also proposed in these romantic forecasts, but the whole exercise was plagued by unreliable data; I also worked around the Great Moss Swamp and the proposed irrigation scheme on the plain below but again accurate measurements were most difficult. Until folk realise the difficulty of

getting data from sites that may have trees in shelterbelts for one season, but not the next, and floods to sweep away sites each two year period, I must suggest that you leave your desks to put on gumboots at regular intervals. and give it a try!."



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:20:34 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:06:35 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:25:24 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:16:10 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:09:41 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 2:45:24 pm

Dear Commissioners,

Please explain to us why having the big jets parked up due to Covid hasn't made a jot of difference to the greenhouse gas levels?

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 9:16:47 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 11:09:32 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:45:34 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:55:14 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Also personally I would ask this, are you people completely stupid or are you working to an already agreed agenda?

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED].

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:25:16 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:06:34 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:15:52 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 3:25:37 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 5:45:31 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:38:38 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:25:23 am

Dear Commissioners,

I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY CHANGES AS YOU HAVE PROPOSED.

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:28:52 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 5:09:49 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: 
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 1:48:48 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:25:37 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 6:06:27 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:58:42 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:06:31 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:06:43 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 10:35:58 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:35:55 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 5:17:15 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:06:37 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:28:51 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:55:22 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Whangaparaoa

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 5:06:48 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:48:43 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:48:50 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:16:18 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 6:48:43 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan.

By promoting a move to electric vehicles the proposals support child labour and work practices not aligned to the internal labour organisation's guidelines. It ignores that one of the major constituents of electric batteries is cobalt and that the Republic of Congo is the world's largest producer of cobalt. Has the commission taken that into account?

Further, has the commission also taken into account the world's reserves of lithium, the major component of electric batteries? At current volumes, the reserves are expected to run out in approximately 30 years. By significantly increasing the use of e-vehicles this will reduce to less than 20 years. Is the commission prepared to commit our nation to a strategy that is not long term?

Then, there is no plan for what to do with depleted batteries.

E-vehicles, using old technology such as batteries is not the long term answer to reducing NZ emissions. The commission needs to be more visionary and promote a long term solution. Hydrogen is the future but there is nothing in this plan that promotes a sustainable zero carbon energy source. The use of electric vehicle powered by lithium is not zero carbon. Is the commission also taking into account the whole production and transportation cycle? It does not appear to be which is misleading our nation. As we live in the same world as the producers of the components of the batteries we need to also take into account their carbon emissions if we truly believe we want to make a difference.

NZ is one of the few countries that can truly embrace a true zero carbon energy future if it is prepared to invest and develop hydrogen technology. Look to South Korea and what it is doing. NZ must do the same if we want to make a difference in reducing the world's carbon emissions. The impact we have on the world's carbon emissions coming from NZ is miniscule but if we embrace a hydrogen future we can have an enormous impact by stopping mining in producer countries, stop shipping and production of raw material but more importantly we can become an exporter of hydrogen and hydrogen technology. Imagine what our economy and future would look like where we produce all our own energy needs. No coal, no battery waste, no oil. That is the future and we need to be investing now.

The commission is short sighted and needs to rethink its plan.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:35:45 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Wednesday, 31 March 2021 5:36:08 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 4:55:24 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 5:25:15 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:45:14 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 3:28:54 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:28:43 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 12:28:43 pm

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:45:09 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Tuesday, 30 March 2021 6:55:30 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 7:45:13 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 9:35:44 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 11:45:32 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 8:25:15 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hello - Climate Commission](#)
Subject: Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice
Date: Monday, 29 March 2021 10:38:49 am

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning.

According to the Commission's own analysis, New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

These costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Under the ETS emissions are already capped, and any extra reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) will simply free up emissions in other sectors (i.e. the 'waterbed effect').

The Commission must be aware that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – likely in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. This is dishonest policy making, exploiting fear of climate change to impose ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy.

It speaks volumes that New Zealanders are expected to provide feedback on these proposals without having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will only cost 1 percent of GDP. The impression left by this untransparent consultation process is that the Commission knows its modelling is so fundamentally flawed that it will undermine the basis of the recommendations.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support a plan to reshape the entire economy if policy makers are not willing to be upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]