

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 21 March 2021 12:55 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I support the Climate Change Commission's action plan.

Any action is now vital. Nothing will initiate a faster development of new technologies than quickly removing the burning of fossil fuels from our environment.

We are on the tipping point, were if we do not act immediately, water will replace both CO2 and methane as the major greenhouse effect. This is well established in atmospheric physics. The science cannot be ignored in favour of profit nor the future of the coming generations.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 9:25 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners

Quite simply, this plan is not needed, not desirable, not practical and not affordable.

It is ill considered madness.

I hardly need to elaborate my reasons on the ludicrous proposals, but let's start by saying it is essential for supply and financial reasons to fully develop all natural gas resources available to NZ over the next 20 to 30 years.

This will provide time and money to introduce alternative adequate energy supplies.

And as for reducing lamb and beef - what the hell, simply why? This is insane, this will do nothing at all apart from increase food costs.

As for the political drive that is expediting these nonsense proposals in a farcical time frame for consultation or implementation, well I have complete contempt for the process.

Otherwise, I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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 in the Taxpayers' Union submission.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 10:16 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's proposals as they stand, and offer solid reasons why in the links below.

Whilst the 7 Guiding Principles are admirable, the resulting plan is highly flawed.

I am an ardent supporter of doing what we can to look after our planet, and 10 years ago installed what was then the largest solar array in NZ to achieve a world-first of solar-powering 90% of our metal-product manufacturing plant in Auckland.

As a member of the Maintenance Engineering Society of NZ (MESNZ) I have assisted with creation of the MESNZ submission submitted by [REDACTED]

I wholly support the MESNZ submission available at:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/brufb4v35m0huid/MESNZ%20Submission%20to%20Climate%20Change%20Commission-MA-r1.docx?dl=0>

The MESNZ submission is written by an expert in the field, and I urge you to deeply consider it. We have put a lot of work into this, and its contributory documents, going back 4 years.

Further, I also fully support the submission by The Taxpayers' Union, available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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 in the Taxpayers' Union submission.

What is proposed is massive - far bigger and with far greater unintended consequences than the CCC has suggested, and with a zero to negative effect on the planet as a whole. Almost all of the most seriously affected stakeholders will at the time of closure of these submissions be almost entirely ignorant of the proposed changes and the effect it will have on their lives.

As such the development of a plan for New Zealand should be made in an open, honest and frank manner over sufficient time to fully engage with all stakeholders as best we can.

I urge that the current plan be completely reworked.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

MESNZ

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 3:49 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's current plan. It will not help the world and will hurt New Zealand financially.

With India and China commissioning a number of new coal fired power plants weekly how can New Zealand's efforts even be contemplated when the results are going to be so damaging to our economy for no gain to the world's emissions?

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

ps. I have been driving a Nisan LEAF 100% electric car for the last four years and have a 5.3 Kw solar array on the roof to charge the car.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 March 2021 10:26 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's recommendations that our government have said they will adopt.

My main reason for opposing these plans is because no considerations have been put in place for population growth or plans to reduce New Zealand's population. I believe the main reason the world is having environmental issues now and will continue to do so in the future is due to our growing population. The footprint each human has on this planet is obviously much larger than that of any other species and the fact that our population continues to grow is a major issue now and is only going to make the situation worse in the future. It is all fine and good to put these recommendations in place in a bid to hopefully reduce the human footprint but with the population growing it is still an uphill battle not to mention other issues like child poverty and our housing crisis.

So how do I think we should reduce our population?

I feel the best way is to encourage future generations to have less children, note I say encourage not force. The best way to create an incentive for families to have just 1 or 2 children is with a universal benefit system. Everyone who qualifies for a WINZ benefit that pays an amount based on the number of children in your care or Working For Families will receive the same amount regardless of the number of children you have in your care. That means a family with 1 child receives the same as a family with 6 children. The link below shows the current family tax credit rates, I feel the best solution is for all families who qualify for Working for Families to receive the rate for 3 children, this means more money each week for families with 1 or 2 children and less for those with 4 or more children, based on this table everyone would receive at most \$295 a week.

<https://www.ird.govt.nz/-/media/project/ir/home/documents/forms-and-guides/ir200---ir299/ir271/ir271-2021.pdf>

So that existing families are not penalised this system would only apply to families who have children after such a policy is implemented. A family who currently have 1 or 2 children would receive an increase in their benefit, a family with 3 children there would be no change for a family with 4 to 6 children there would be no change but the rate would also not increase if any further children are born after the implementation of such policy.

There would also be a limit on how long you can receive such a benefit to stop families choosing to have more children to keep receiving such benefits. The limit would be until the oldest child turns 18, this means a couple who has more than 1 child would not receive any benefit once the oldest child is 18. Once again this would only apply to children born after such policy is implemented.

If such policy is implemented our government would need to consider how to pay for the increase in benefits for those with 1 or 2 children and also what happens when we have an aging population. I feel with a lower population entering the work force in 20 years this will reduce the demand for a lot of things such as housing and upgrading cities infrastructure such as roading.

While my idea may seem quite extreme I feel this is a better approach for future generations as opposed to the ideas proposed by the Climate Change Commission.

Regards

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 7:55 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

w/o the typos:

please ignore the copy provided earlier which has typos.

BTW it is very difficult to edit your page.

There is much data that I can provide to back up the statements made but I am concerned that the CCC is adopting a Clayton's approach to the submissions.

Please show NZ'ers that is not the case.

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's approach in so far as it is based on a premise that should be properly challenged, before it is accepted as being valid.

Only then might it become a legitimate precursor for whatever steps we might as a nation take to mitigate our impacts on the environment.

It is respectfully submitted that it is not enough for our Climate Change Commission to repeat the mantra that its conclusions are evidence based, when the evidence is clearly limited to the very short time span in geological and astrophysical terms (some 800,000 years) that the IPCC has based some of its findings upon. Doing so is exceedingly misleading and disingenuous and reflects a very selective approach to the data.

There is now a clear body of evidence produced by many leading scientists (astrophysicists, geologists and others) that posits that whilst we are clearly seeing the impacts of climate change, it is not necessarily all human induced, and even if only partially human induces, the proposition is far from being properly established..

However, as a proxy for pollution, over fishing, over farming etc . we all accept an obligation to mitigate the human impact on the environment, both here and overseas.

But that argument should not be confused with any necessity or requirement to control CO2 emissions (and CH4 and NO2 and N2O and SO2 etc.).

That also raises the collateral issue of the efficacy of NZ's ETS and the necessity and justification for a carbon tax to curb CO2. That argument, it is respectfully submitted is far from settled. Challenging CO2 emissions and the whole carbon argument is a first step that our Climate Change Commission should embark upon before it is assumed as a given. To do otherwise is to assume the validity of the opinion and the politics of the day, just as occurred with Galileo and other leading scientists who were vilified by the church and the state and by many of their fellow scientists when they postulated new theories. That should for NZ's Climate Change Commission be a very object lesson.

Aside from that important first step there are other arguments that need to be properly considered. The first is the question of the net carbon footprint of the electrification of vehicles. Whilst there appears to be some evidence that

supports the proposition that where electricity is produced largely from renewables (as is largely the case in NZ with its wind, water and rain as Meridian advertises daily) the net effect favours EV's, that does not deal with the significant changes that will occur at the margin; ie. where incremental electricity demand in NZ cannot be produced from renewables. The second question relates to the marginal cost of providing such renewable energy. There are significant issues with the infrastructure requirements that need to be properly examined as a precursor to policy and strategy development. Many NZ'ers are already hard pressed to meet their current utility bills. The question that needs to be addressed as a precursor to any policy change/s is what are those costs likely to be to the average NZ'er (and to the government when it loses its fuel taxation revenue streams).

Lastly if the Climate Change Commission was serious in dealing with the issues in an even handed and evidentiary based way, rather than formulating its positions based on political opinions that need to be favoured, it would consider the benefits of nuclear power and its beneficial impacts on CO2 emissions, and infrastructure and electricity costs.

I otherwise endorse the submissions made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 10:55 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's endeavours to have their plans implemented that would in summary add punatively to the cost of living and producing in New Zealand.

Whilst it is clear the imposition of the Commissions proposals would not just would impact life here in ways but that they can only position our country at a relative disadvantage to the rest of the world in terms of living standards and economic outcomes but would do this without any measurable of impactful gains on the direction of climate changes.

New Zealanders cannot be expected to support proposals 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 and it's objectives re-started.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 26 March 2021 3:55 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's intrusive regulatory proposals that are additional to the ETS. As far as I can see the Commission has made no case that they are necessary or desirable for achieving the government's goals.

Moreover, they presume to knowledge that the Commission does not possess as to the evolution of future technologies and the means diverse firms and individuals will surely find to economise on emissions under a non-discriminatory ETS.

The presumption reminds me of the debacle of the oil-substitution "Think Big" projects of the late 1970s when government committed taxpayers (without their knowing) to underwrite billions of dollars of projects under the presumption that oil prices would rise in real terms at 3% pa from US\$30 a barrel. If I recall correctly, world oil prices fell sharply instead, to a low of round US\$15 a barrel, and the losses as a percent of GDP were comparable to those of the Christchurch earthquakes, except that in the latter case overseas insurers picked up much of the tab.

Doubtless my memory is somewhat faulty, but the point I am making does not depend on the accuracy of the precise numbers. The point is that government should not be 'picking winners' when they do not have to be and they have neither the knowledge nor the incentive to get it right. Distant future losses are a problem for another government, not the one making the current decision. Under the ETS, the government does not need to pick winners.

I am particularly concerned about what seems to be becoming little more than a mantra among those promoting ill-justified sector- or activity-specific directives: "The ETS alone is 'not enough'."

I have taken the time to look into all the references the Commission cites in support of its assertion that: "As international research and experience now shows, the most effective and efficient approach is to implement a much more comprehensive and diverse suite of climate policies".

For example, with respect to subsidies for EV uptake, the [Canadian EcoFiscal](#) paper found that such subsidies were too costly. It also observed that "additional policies that apply to emissions covered by a cap-and-trade system will tend not to lead to additional emissions reductions overall." Here are some more direct quotes from that paper:

"As our case study indicates, the mere existence of these problems [specific market adjustment problems eg charging station networks for EVs] is not enough to justify a policy response. The benefits of overcoming these market problems must outweigh the costs of doing so, We find electric vehicle subsidies to be a high-cost approach relative to other policy alternatives. (page IV)

"In particular, additional policies that apply to emissions covered by a cap-and-trade system will tend not to lead to additional emissions reductions overall. While the policy may lead to additional emissions reductions within a given sector, the total number of permits in the system—and thus the total allowable number of emissions—remains unchanged. As a result, emissions reductions from the additional policy can be offset by higher emissions elsewhere in the cap-and-trade system. In the case of Ontario and Quebec, the outcome may be fewer permit imports from California through their linked permit markets, but not necessarily lower emissions overall. (page IV)

"RECOMMENDATION #2: Governments should clearly demonstrate complementarity before adopting non-pricing policies More GHG policies do not necessarily make for a better climate strategy. Additional, non-pricing policies can increase costs and undermine the effectiveness of a carbon price. Policymakers should focus their efforts on policies that clearly have one of the three rationales explored in this report. They should fill gaps in carbon pricing policies, boost the signal of the carbon price, or generate significant co-benefits. Policies that do not fall into at least one of these categories will not be complementary to a carbon price. Governments should therefore clearly demonstrate the complementarity of proposed non-pricing policies prior to their adoption. This requirement can help limit high-cost policies. It can also limit undue influence from interest groups and industries seeking preferential treatment under prescriptive or technology-specific climate policies." [Page VI]

"RECOMMENDATION #6: With the implementation of an economy-wide carbon price, governments should phase out and avoid redundant, high-cost, or ineffective policies All Canadian governments should seek to identify and eliminate existing policies that no longer make sense given the implementation of economy-wide carbon pricing. In past years, these existing policies may have represented practical policy approaches in the absence of carbon pricing; today, they are unlikely to be either as effective or cost-effective as a broad-based carbon price. The emergence of pan-Canadian carbon pricing as a policy norm creates an important opportunity to shift toward more cost-effective policy by clearing the books of some older and higher-cost regulations and subsidies. Governments should only employ additional policies that are genuinely complementary to carbon pricing." [Page VII]

Admittedly the IEA (2017) paper proposes (pages 5 & 6) supplementary policies. But it is for the dishonourable reason of hiding the high costs of emission reductions from the public, whereas an ETS would make them transparent. But even here in this case it does pay at least lip service to the issue of wellbeing:

"The challenge for policy makers is to map the policy landscape to identify policy interactions, determine whether the benefits of additional policies merit the added costs, and if so, manage interactions by adjusting policy design." [page 7]

The OECD (2013) paper is also open on supplementary measures (as am I), but again the case for them must overcome a presumption against them. Here is a relevant quote:

"Furthermore, due to loopholes in emissions trading coverage, technology-specific subsidies may in some cases need to be considered, while technology standards maybe a useful complement to emissions trading schemes in order to help drive technological change. However, the costs and benefits of introducing complementary policies must be carefully examined and should only be introduced when they lower the net cost of reducing emissions for society."

I have spotted nothing in the Commission's draft advice that shows that "the costs and benefits of introducing complementary policies" have been carefully examined.

The remaining "authority", Planetary Economics seem to be about co-benefits and behavioural economics, perhaps with an unwarranted presumption that governments are less prone to fallacious thinking, rent seeking, short-termism, capture and bureaucratic incentives, than the people who vote them into power. But I have not found a full copy of that material to see if it takes wellbeing seriously - ensuring that the benefits of proposed policies will exceed the costs, as perceived by those affected.

I am of course aware of that I am far from alone in these views. In particular, I commend the submissions by The New Zealand Initiative, the Taxpayers' Union, and others which express similar concerns about policy over-reach.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 5:26 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan that will unnecessarily damage our economy when we already have a perfectly adequate ETS system in place.

Your plan will not result in lower emissions, so why, why, why are you suggesting another approach?

I have to question your motives and wonder if you're not driven by an agenda to "re-engineer" our society, our lives, our culture and our economy.

I have read and endorse the submission by the Taxpayers' Union so will not repeat their arguments here.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 8:39 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Climate Change Commissioners,

I am writing in regards to the draft emissions budget that was brought to my attention by the NZ taxpayers union.

I am incredibly grateful that these long overdue changes are finally coming into effect.

I am disappointed to see that my fellow taxpayers are focusing solely on financial cost instead of the health and well being of our country and our environment, in opposing the draft emissions budget.

Please remember that a large proportion of tax payers DO support these changes, despite a social media campaign encouraging us to complain about them with a copy and pasted compliant email.

Keep up the great work!

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 1:39 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Commissioners

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's draft plan, released on 31 January 2021.

I don't understand why the Commission is proposing a whole range of measures that will do nothing to reduce net emissions but will impose economic and social costs on New Zealanders. We have a perfectly good ETS in place which, if allowed to function normally, would result in reduced emissions at least cost to the country.

Instead, the Commission is proposing a range of measures that will simply transfer emissions between different emitters but will do nothing to reduce the country's net emissions.

The Commission's plans are no more effective than squeezing an inflated balloon in order to reduce its volume. A squeeze in one place just results in a bulge somewhere else.

I am particularly alarmed that the economic modelling underpinning the proposals has not been released. This makes any sort of serious critique of the proposals almost impossible. Such far-reaching proposals should never be considered without proper scrutiny. A few more extra months to enable proper analysis and scrutiny will do not harm at all compared with making the wrong policy choice.

As well as my comments above, I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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.

Best regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 7:45 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy. Ask the people literally living on the streets what they think because there are plenty of them, with more to come.

New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme in case you weren't aware of that very simple fact.

I don't know where you get the idea that you can do the work of God. Unless you can walk on water and stop the sea you have Buckley's chance of changing the weather, these costly proposals will not even result in lower emissions than existing policies. Banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles will simply free up emissions in other sectors.

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. You have no right exploiting the 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 (if it bothered reading it at all) 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. A very honest and transparent government indeed!

The plan should be scrapped.

Yours sincerely,



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 6:45 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Commissioners,

I stand **opposed** to the Climate Change Commission's plan to undermine our economy and way of life with its gambit of poorly-conceived central planning recommendations. They reveal a dangerous kowtowing to globalist, climate-alarmist, sovereignty-destroying ideologues and foreign powers hell-bent on destroying our nation's freedoms, wealth and livelihood.

Many on the Commission may well have good intentions but the pathway to Hell is readily paved with good intentions. The Climate-alarmist presuppositions underpinning your moves to radically 'transform' our nation are **ill-conceived**. You've been deceived (and now you're deceiving others) with **pseudo-science**, UN IPCC **political rhetoric** (cloaked as science), **socialist-inspired tax burdens** and the religious zeal of a **pagan cult**!

The radical mindset and destructive tendencies of your Commission members represent an abuse of power and unrighteous influence over our legislative and democratic processes. This is not government 'by the people for the people'...but an ideology-driven **communist regime-style** government **of the people for the 'planet'**! What a joke - our impact on the planet is **miniscule**! Whereas, the impact of your damaging recommendations on our livelihood is **enormous**. Are **all** of the Commission's members **pagan worshippers of Gaia** (the goddess of 'mother' Earth)?! Or is it only those members most dominating amongst you? Shame on those of you seeking to enslave the rest of us by way of a religious zeal for 'saving the planet'. You're not 'saving' anyone! Quite the opposite - you're being used as instruments **not to save but to destroy** our wealth and liberties by way of heavier tax burdens, oppressive regulations and other damaging restrictions on our God-given freedoms, prosperity and livelihood.

Is your moral compass **no longer oriented North** towards God? Are you now at the UNFCCC's beck n' call? Have you grown so flippant about (and so eager to forgo) our national sovereignty that you now believe that Livestock needs culling (farming is the spine of our economy!), that Coal is evil, that Natural Gas is wicked and that Fossil Fuels are of the devil?! They are all God-given, precious resources for us to use for the good of all New Zealanders - used responsibly, but used nonetheless - **not left in the ground** like they're somehow sacred and not to be disturbed!

Who has bewitched you, O' foolish compatriots!? We have some of the best farmers in the world, have a natural gas resource that's clean, cost-efficient and accessible, and produce some of the cleanest coal on the planet...and **you want to outlaw them all!** As a result of our Government banning oil & gas exploration and disincentivising coal mining, we imported more coal last year than in 2018 and 2019 combined! You'd rather import dirty coal than mine clean coal ourselves - really!?

You want to not only see coal mining and new gas connections banned, but also any gas-fired bar-b-ques in our own backyard - on our own property!? What makes you feel so entitled to **infringe upon our property rights** and freedoms if not for a **communist bent** and belief that our property rights count for very little? If you like CCP-style central planning so much, then go and live in China...and let us be.

Better still, stay here but **snap out of it** - please (!) for the sake of all New Zealanders. Protect our treasured freedoms, our national sovereignty and way of life.

If not, then any attempts of yours to further undermine them will be considered an act of treason, no less.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Porirua 5024

NEW ZEALAND !

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 20 March 2021 6:36 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly oppose the Climate Change Commission's proposed but unnecessary plan.

It lacks economic merit. It lacks scientific merit. It lacks political merit. But most of all, it lacks honesty with the people of New Zealand - you cannot expect to rally the support of the people when withholding your assumptions and models. That is not how things are done.

The plan should be scrapped and the process re-started - to avoid unnecessary legal challenges.

I otherwise endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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], PhD

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 3:19 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

## CLIMATE CHANGE COMMISSIONERS

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly object to the Climate Change Commission's adopting unnecessary plans and policies to cause abrupt changes that will grossly disturb the NZ economy in the current turbulent world environment.

1. NZ is already moving with present strategies and plans towards NET ZERO Carbon. There is no practical need to introduce additional punitive and sudden actions that are being demanded by Government.
2. We must examine the **Cost/Benefit ratio** for EACH proposal. WE must have plans and processes in place first to implement any changes eg new powerlines, sub-stations, new processing plants etc
3. Toyota Japan have already stated this week worldwide that they will be unable to meet any realistic demands for electric motor vehicles over the next decade or so [PROBLEM Examples: How will people with no garage who park on the street each night be able to charge their vehicles??] [What compensation will people (delivery trucks, taxis, etc) have if they have to wait hours in line to charge their electric vehicles for example?]
4. Climate is more than just temperature increases (storms, rainfall, other meteorological factors at a location). Any imposition on NZ Citizens that is excessively expensive will cause severe havoc on the lives of people, GDP growth, travel, work operations, and infrastructure. WE must not produce unnecessary fear of climate change and we must not impose unproven, theoretical, or model-driven concepts that will drastically affect people's lives and the NZ economy. Dat and historical records must be used: not just idealised models that often over-predict.
5. The temperature goes up and down 5C to 10C EACH DAY and no one dies from that. There is NO emergency! We must proceed slowly and with great caution.
6. We the people MUST review any data, records, forecasts, idealistic modelling etc... that have been used to form the basis of the Commissions's policies. The CCC must be transparent now, and not after! [Example: Methane is only 1.8 ppm, and has little to almost zero effect on ALL radiation ... so why destroy (upset/reduce) our farming community for virtually 0 gain??]
7. I believe the so-called Plan should be scrapped and that the CCC should start from scratch with a lot of detail on each step, and the means of implementing them (eg: supply of construction workers and engineers for installing systems).

Thanks ..

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 March 2021 4:17 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I'm not going to engage in a lengthy listing and articulation of all the problems with your draft report as the outcome seems to be pre-determined and I have other things I could more pleasurably waste my time on. Suffice it to say, the plan:

- fails to understand that a cost-benefit test requires estimation, and weighing, of both costs and benefits;
- seems to be unaware of many basic principles of economics;
- either doesn't understand how the ETS works, or doesn't wish to (the stated reasons for not relying on the ETS are, to put it mildly, fatuous);
- is characterised by a touching, but foolish, belief in the virtues of central planning;
- is permeated throughout by paternalistic and megalomaniac thinking (you know better than we do what's good for us).

In short, the plan offers no benefits while almost certainly creating massive costs. It should be scrapped.

I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union, available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission) .

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Professor of Finance, [REDACTED] (ret.)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 20 March 2021 2:07 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan to adopt a plan based on a derisory consultation process.

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 unwillingness to share data and models means I do not trust the conclusions - what have you got to hide? - do you even have robust data and reliable models?

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](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 2:25 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

- I have carefully read the submission made by the Taxpayers Union. I have also studied the lengthy and detailed response to the Commissions proposals by Beef and Lamb NZ, and Federated Farmers.
- I am a member of both these organisations and I urge the Commission to carefully consider the issues raised in their submissions.
- Balanced policy is required that takes into account the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of our national and global community.
- Reductions in livestock numbers will have consequences for each of these objectives.
- A failure to differentiate between different GW gases, their effect and their life cycle, will also impact on the these objectives without benefiting the climate.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Sarah Bassett

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 5:38 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lower Hutt

19th March 2021

Dear Commissioners,

In the interest of transparency, I am generally opposed to government sponsored central planning of every kind. Recent history (since 1925) has generally shown central planning to be something of a flop.

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan to address climate change and other global warming issues. I believe that humanity, amongst other species, has much more to fear from climate change of the opposite kind and in particular, global cooling.

If it is correct that New Zealand is already on track to achieve net zero emissions using existing tools, there is no need and a great deal of potential harm to be inflicted on the lives of New Zealanders.

These proposals amount to additional reductions that stand to harm New Zealanders exactly when their needs are greatest. Banning of gas barbecues and discouraging the use of gas would have been a disaster in the Christchurch earthquakes and will certainly do harm in any future catastrophe.

In particular, I would be far more impressed if your Commission was able to begin with positive constructive suggestions followed only by those changes that might be sensibly ameliorated by those suggestions. Banning stuff is easy. Viable alternatives are a little more difficult.

While there is little doubt in my mind that climate change is actually happening, no one has yet been able to tell me what percentage (or other proportion) of that is in fact man-made and what proportion is from natural causes occurring elsewhere in the Universe. I suspect that no one knows and that the factual position is unknowable. Despite that, the Commission insists on imposing dramatic costs – possibly in the hundreds of billions – for little, if any, climate benefit. It would also be useful to know for what proportion of the earth's climate change New Zealand accounts.

Exploiting an unquantified fear of an unknowable climate change event is dishonest policy making. No public agrees to be bound by laws to enable the politically motivated outcomes, including costs inflicted, by a temporary political power.

New Zealanders should all have easy access to the economic modelling and a sensible idea of actual costs behind the Commission's forecasts. 1 percent of GDP is hard to believe and impossible to dispute if the calculations are not



available . I for one certainly have the impression that the Commission knows its modelling is sufficiently flawed to undermine the basis of its recommendations. I sincerely hope the names if not the calculations of all Commissioners are widely published so that all New Zealanders know exactly who is inflicting such potential damage on them.

I also endorse the submission of the Taxpayers' Union available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 6:16 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I disagree strongly with the extent to which you are proposing to limit the use of LPG in residential homes. LPG is an important alternative for many families who do not use electricity for purposes such as heating swimming pools, central heating, heating hot water, and cooking.

One of the biggest advantages of using LPG for heating hot water is that it allows you to only heat the water you intend to use. This is especially beneficial for small households, or people who often travel. Not wasting electricity on heating hot water has obvious environmental advantages, and there is no viable electricity-based alternative for this. If anything, the use of LPG for heating hot water at home should be promoted. The same is true for cooking over open flames (as in BBQ's) and metal pots, with only costly induction ranges being more energy efficient.

Research has also shown that flued heating and gas-fired central heating is the most efficient forms of heating for your home - forcing people to use electricity for this seems counter-productive, especially given how much of our electricity is still being generated by burning fossil fuels and other non-renewables when spot prices are high.

I am afraid that the commission's views on the continued use of LPG by households is colored by the lobbying of electricity companies who stand to make greater margins from the use of electricity by households who will be left without a choice in the matter.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 7:10 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with your unwarranted and arguably fraudulent actions.

Firstly, as the Russians, Chinese and Indians assert, climate change is due to natural causes and your contrary position marks you out as promoters of fraud.

Your Minister, NIWA, Professor James Renwick, The PM's Chief Science Adviser and Ministry for the Environment have repeatedly ignored requests for empirical scientific evidence that human carbon emissions cause climate change. This is standard misdirection (no complex fraud would be without it) Every request for same is met by a referral to the UN IPCC Report AR5 of 2014 which contains no evidence whatsoever (as you are or should be aware if you had read that on-line document). Furthermore, I am in a position to prove that while atmospheric CO2 has had a minor influence at up to the preindustrial level of 280ppm, it is limited by the Beer-Lambert law of physics.

Secondly, the increase in atmospheric CO2 has demonstrably caused a greening of planet Earth. It is a gas essential for all plant life and the flourishing plant life replenishes the oxygen which sustains us. You are either familiar with this beneficial effect or ought to be. In which case you should be ashamed to claim to be an environmentalist and yet promote a policy at huge cost which, in the extremely unlikely event you are successful, reduces atmospheric levels of CO2.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CA1zUW4uOSw>

Thirdly, the discharge of CH4 into the atmosphere plays no role whatsoever in climate change because it is oxidised within 12 days to form CO2 and water vapour. Because it is only 16AMU in weight the residue moves higher into the stratosphere where it has other valuable uses and contributes to ozone formation.

The only greenhouse gas which influences climate from place to place and from time to time is water vapour and in that role it works in tandem with the other stages of the water cycle and with clouds, the water in ocean, ice and snow. The water cycle is the most powerful force on Earth and to equate human emissions with this is criminally stupid. In New Zealand any school child at year 12/13 can establish that towns on the same altitude and latitude with lower humidity have higher daily maximum temperatures, and higher diurnal temperature ranges than towns with higher humidity. This means that any school child is able to see what ignorant charlatans you and your Minister are. I will be happy to show you the proof because this is fatal to the dogma your Minister and PM promotes.

Given that most other economies will continue to use fossil fuels and increase their emissions, and given that most competent scientists believe that you and your masters have falsely claimed you can achieve a reduction in atmospheric CO2, CH4 and N2O, while that is not within your capability, I believe you must prepare for allegations that you are committing malfeasance by your actions.

The approaching Eddy Grand Solar Minimum will eventually cause the atmosphere to be cooler, at which time the present oceanic out-gassing will cease and the ocean will again begin to take up atmospheric CO2. At that time the level of atmospheric CO2 will fall, but meantime the climate will be much cooler and you will look like idiots. The solar cycles as cause for climate change is proven by the fluctuations of the size and temperature of the Earth's Thermosphere with a Thermosphere Climate Index that fluctuates in lockstep with solar activity. See this link...

<https://spaceweatherarchive.com/2018/09/27/the-chill-of-solar-minimum/>

The Vostok ice core analysis showed that the atmospheric temperature changes typically led a change in the level of atmospheric CO2 by an average of 800 years , plus or minus 400 years. So changes in the level of CO2 have always trailed changes in temperature and never the other way around. So CO2 has never been a climate change agent and with CH4 at 1.8ppm and N2O at 0.3ppm only water vapour can be separately identified as a change agent when one analyses the impacts of greenhouse gases on weather.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdNw8-Cq8h8&feature=emb\\_logo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdNw8-Cq8h8&feature=emb_logo)

Tragically for you, the Neils Bohr Institute is now publishing data which shows that for Greenland , the year 1885AD was the coldest in 10,000 years and today's average global temperature is about 2.5 degrees lower than the Holocene Thermal Maximum. See...

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pW16LGVpfc>

Given that the OECD climate computer models have been caught erroneously over-stating the thermal effect of a doubling of atmospheric CO2 by three times the true level (as advised to you by Environomics (NZ) Trust). This means there is no problem to solve so you have no purpose to fulfil.

There is no possibility of the New Zealand taxpayer getting any benefit whatsoever from your extremely costly plans.

The matter which you should be addressing your attention to, is the urgent need to diversify New Zealand's energy sources away from finite fossil fuels. But this can only be done when the EROEI (Energy Return of Energy Invested) of alternative technologies and fuels more closely match the EROEI of oil, gas and coal fuels and related technologies. The process will bankrupt the country if not done with care. Meantime you cannot expect anyone's support for your thinly veiled attempts at fraud.

I hold that anyone complicit in this trickery to be a fraudster. Cease and desist because sooner or later you will be indicted if you continue. Your call.

May I suggest you get an opinion from Crown Law and tell them the following.

- you are acting on behalf of an extremely popular fraud for which your advisers have no empirical scientific evidence.
- for which I also have sufficient empirical scientific evidence to refute your misguided and disproven theory.
- the regular 200-year Grand Solar Minimum is now on our doorstep. So I would bet good money that the Earth's climate is going to get cooler rather than warmer.

You folk got yourselves a great hospital pass didn't you? I am not going to go away. I will keep on until the NZ Serious Fraud Office has no alternative but to investigate.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address line 1]

[Redacted address line 2]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 10:39 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

Burning coal does not pollute the atmosphere. The smoke does that. People who want to ban the burning of fossil fuels are wasting everybody's time and are trying to solve the wrong problem. So don't ban fossil fuels just ban the smoke. If a gadget that treated and made emissions harmless was fitted to every stinking smokestack then the problems caused by those emissions would be eliminated overnight. Banning the burning of fossil fuels is not going to happen because coal burning countries just don't care. To solve a problem we must first identify the problem.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 12:36 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan as being very unrealistic to implement. It unfairly punishes New Zealand farmers and horticulturalists who are some of the most productive food producers in the world. I would recommend that New Zealand increases its food production to efficiently meet the needs of an increased world population and to help keep the New Zealand economy afloat after the devastating impacts of Covid-19.

New Zealand is already on track to achieve net-zero emissions using existing tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme.

I do not believe that banning certain types of vehicles will work in practice. Vehicles are often needed for work or whanau reasons. I believe that financial incentives and taxes would be much more realistic in being able to reduce vehicle use. What you are proposing is the equivalent of attempting to ban alcohol or cigarettes and this would simply not happen.

My feedback to your six "key questions" is Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree (changes are too ambitious); Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 6:55 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's first draft report. In particular, I am shocked that the Commission has abandoned its narrow brief to maximise CO2 abatement at an affordable price.

New Zealand has signed up to an international project to reduce global emissions over time, so that further mean warming does not exceed 1°C. We have finite resources and many other objectives (eg reduction of child poverty, better healthcare, more housing). The key question for the Commission is – how much economic pain should New Zealand volunteer for the global climate project? Put differently, should we spend as much on CO2 abatement as we spend on (say) international aid? Should our climate spend exceed what we spend on homelessness?

While this is ultimately a political question, it requires a great deal of groundwork and research. That is the job of the unelected 'expert' Commission. But it has not done that job. Instead the Commissioners have acted as wannabe politicians and set out their own idiosyncratic views as to how our country could be improved.

Once an annual level of investment is decided, the next question is: should our scarce dollars attempt to abate as many global emissions as possible? I was gob-smacked to learn that the Commission's answer is negative. It apparently has no intention of seeking maximum bang for our bucks. It will trade off emission abatement for a host of other social environmental and political objectives which it subjectively finds more attractive

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 and setting an effective 'carbon price' of \$50 per Mt. Despite that, the Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders.

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.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the Commission's first report is that it relies so heavily on a secretive 'black box' model which has never been either verified or validated. No respectable economist has been able to concur with the Commission's incredible claim that the plan will cost no more than 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 will not 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](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 29 March 2021 3:36 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

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.

[REDACTED]

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 sender's name and signature.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 2:45 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly oppose the planned course of action.

These changes will likely have a significant negative impact on our economic growth and standard of living while doing little or nothing to effect climate change, particularly on a global level compared with countries like China and India. We are a drop in the ocean.

I wish to 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.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 9:48 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I'm very much committed to reducing the net increase in world Green House Gases from my own lifestyle, from use of fossil fuels and reduction in tropical forests and soils elsewhere. I also totally oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan to use selected Government intervention to reduce net CO2. By far the most effective and efficient method is to use market forces through extending the ETS trading scheme as fast as possible while managing the human cost of this.

The Commission's costly proposals will not result in net lower emissions than under the ETS

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. The application of science and market forces will have the best effect and the broadest support.

Such broad sweeping proposals should not be implemented in haste without wide, deep and considered consultation. This should include rigorous economic and scientific analysis.

The plan should go back to the drawing board. Full consultation with education should take place and a plan drawn up to include ideas and full input from a wide range of the general public, economic, business, scientific circles and our closest allied countries. Lets take our time and start on the right path.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 4:07 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan to dramatically alter the economy.

According to my research the world is on track for an extremely small increase in temperature as a result of increases in carbon dioxide, and the changes proposed by Climate Change Commission will seriously affect New Zealand's economy, without having a measurable effect on the world's temperature.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. [REDACTED] Ph.D. (Yale)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 1:56 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

If the environment actually matters then:

Any movement to alter or coerce change in energy production can only be made from a position of national self reliance.

While we are not in this state any effort - in any aspect of generation or distribution with the environment as a reason - is virtue signalling only.

We need, in order of my personal preference, to develop an "always on" energy infrastructure, based upon: Hydrothermal, Hydro, Gas, Nuclear.

I agree with the comments of the tax payers union

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 2:49 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

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

Just to consider the mentality behind reducing our food producing abilities and quantities. We are allegedly the most efficient producers of meat products in the world. There are two points to this. Firstly as supply always meets demand, where we reduce some other country will increase at a less efficient rate. And the world needs food to help the millions who are undernourished. What are we going to offer them - pine trees. Insanity!

In general I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 10:36 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I ask you to withdraw your plan(s).

The science of climate is very young and unsettled, as you well know.

Modelling of something as complex as the climate is in its infancy, and riddled with poor quality control. There is better quality control over the software in any elevator.

Making an "ensemble" of models with different outputs and pretending that they approximate to the truth is a statistical and scientific nonsense.

"Climate Change" is a political movement, not a scientific one. Many so-called climate scientists are nothing more than political activists.

It has not been proven that man-made emissions of CO2 are changing the climate in a harmful way. Increases in CO2 are beneficial to agriculture and to the greening of the planet, as evidenced by the shrinking of deserts in recent decades. Modest increases in temperature (which is occurring according to the climate scientists chiefly at northern latitudes and on winter nights) are likewise beneficial to humanity, rather than harmful.

I cannot support a plan to destroy New Zealand's economy and radically change its political landscape for no good reason.

My feedback to your six "key questions" are: Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Strongly Disagree; Strongly disagree; None of them; Strongly disagree.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** [REDACTED] action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 10:45 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to unnecessarily affect farming when the science is wrong. Then I grow a kilo of dry matter that the carbon [CO<sub>2</sub>] is sequestered from the atmosphere. When an animal eats the kilo then exhausts the methane into the atmosphere. The methane then in eight to ten years converts to CO<sub>2</sub> and is again available to be reabsorbed into plant material to make the next kilo of dry matter. Sure there is a time factor here, but the process is a cycle, so the conversion to animal exhaust of ten years ago is now converted and available for uptake. Farmers are not actually in the business of manufacturing CO<sub>2</sub>.

So, you are thinking this simple minded farmer just doesn't understand the gravity of the situation.

Well, this simple farmer is saying the stakes are very high, and the science is not conclusive.

And please remember. the world grew more protein last year than in any time in history.

An across the board 15% drop in stock numbers is a blunt instrument, those of us that farm sustainably should not be victimised

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 6:17 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan as it stands without significant modification. The basis of the plan is flawed in terms of targeting resources rather than looking at overall "eco-system" changes and doesn't take into account developments such as 'hydrogen powered vehicles' that may emerge as a better option to electric vehicles at a later period of time.

These plans will significantly damage the economy which is now in a very fragile state.

There are SMARTER ways to achieve climate goals:

- Incentivise businesses to locate where staff live, rather than staff driving from Wellsford (where there is affordable to new homes) to Newmarket etc
- Improve pasture research and management - when clover was used to enrich pastures there was significant methane reduction (composition of cowpats indicated this)
- Restrict 'mega' tourism - mega cruiseships, Dreamliners. As soon as these mega cruiseships get 10 nautical miles from shore they can dump a city of sewerage in our oceans. This is rampant consumerism.
- Be open to "hydrogen vehicle power" - I doubt the world's energy companies are coming to let their massive infrastructure of filling stations just become redundant.

Having worked in the public transport sector, post Covid I don't believe 120% more journeys can be achieved. While significant gains have been made they have been bumped up by including "event transport" in totals. The current models of network planning are unresponsive to customers - customer prefer ferries or trains, and rapid busways. - not buses stuck in traffic. In my area the express services were removed to Gulf Harbour and now it takes a 35 min coastal suburb tiki tour to get the Silverdale busway. An Express service to Albany would double uptake. Also families want to use park n rides and network planners refuse to advocate these - families need to go to childcare and other places locally quickly before their main journey.

We also need to retain gas supplies to offset electricity generation.

Also our electricity network won't support the increased amperage required for rapid charges. All it will take will be an extremely hot summer, a lot of use of airconditioning and an increase of vehicle charging and there will be a likelihood that a shortage of power will bring the network down.

I specifically oppose:

- Ban of imports of light vehicles from 2032 - until there are suitable alternatives for recreational vehicles, potentially hydrogen vehicles. Electric vehicles won't have the capacity to tow a boat substantial distances with steep gradients
- Ban on new connections and gas connections, BBQ's

- Proposals to destock in the agricultural sector

- Increases in fuel prices to subsidise electric cars. This will create great inequities.

The 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

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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 6:17 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan as it stands without significant modification. The basis of the plan is flawed in terms of targeting resources rather than looking at overall "eco-system" changes and doesn't take into account developments such as 'hydrogen powered vehicles' that may emerge as a better option to electric vehicles at a later period of time.

These plans will significantly damage the economy which is now in a very fragile state.

There are SMARTER ways to achieve climate goals:

- Incentivise businesses to locate where staff live, rather than staff driving from Wellsford (where there is affordable to new homes) to Newmarket etc
- Improve pasture research and management - when clover was used to enrich pastures there was significant methane reduction (composition of cowpats indicated this)
- Restrict 'mega' tourism - mega cruiseships, Dreamliners. As soon as these mega cruiseships get 10 nautical miles from shore they can dump a city of sewerage in our oceans. This is rampant consumerism.
- Be open to "hydrogen vehicle power" - I doubt the world's energy companies are coming to let their massive infrastructure of filling stations just become redundant.

Having worked in the public transport sector, post Covid I don't believe 120% more journeys can be achieved. While significant gains have been made they have been bumped up by including "event transport" in totals. The current models of network planning are unresponsive to customers - customer prefer ferries or trains, and rapid busways. - not buses stuck in traffic. In my area the express services were removed to Gulf Harbour and now it takes a 35 min coastal suburb tiki tour to get the Silverdale busway. An Express service to Albany would double uptake. Also families want to use park n rides and network planners refuse to advocate these - families need to go to childcare and other places locally quickly before their main journey.

We also need to retain gas supplies to offset electricity generation.

Also our electricity network won't support the increased amperage required for rapid charges. All it will take will be an extremely hot summer, a lot of use of airconditioning and an increase of vehicle charging and there will be a likelihood that a shortage of power will bring the network down.

I specifically oppose:

- Ban of imports of light vehicles from 2032 -until there are suitable alternatives for recreational vehicles, potentially hydrogen vehicles. Electric vehicles won't have the capacity to tow a boat substantial distances with steep gradients
- Ban on new connections and gas connections, BBQ's

- Proposals to destock in the agricultural sector

- Increases in fuel prices to subsidise electric cars. This will create great inequities.

The 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

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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 5:56 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I have changed the wording supplied by the Taxpayers Union for the simple reason that I believe you will get many items of feedback using their text. I want to make my own point.

I am not aware of how you are going to address the approach New Zealand takes for reducing our carbon footprint, but I am afraid that it will be addressed in the normal way that "political/social" issues are in this country. In my 45 years of voting successive governments have addressed problems in isolation and almost never looked at the big picture. Look at the state of our roads. Most are the same as those I drove on in the 1970s.

We have a very challenging few decades ahead of us. We cannot address this in the way that New Zealand governments traditionally address problems. With the three golden rules of kiwism -

1. She'll be right
2. Near enough is good enough
3. We like our political problems simple, our solutions simpler, and our politicians simpler still

We cannot address climate change (or housing for that matter) with our traditional approach. We need an across the spectrum solution and a long term plan. We cannot risk political theory being allowed to screw this up. So I beg of you, treat this differently, put our future generations at the forefront, ignore the impact the required solutions have on your ability to be re-elected.

Put us first. Please.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 2:36 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

To whom it may concern

The climate change bill is madness it sets NZ on a path to economic destruction. I strongly oppose it.

The costs it will place on rate payers, and tax payers, are enormous. For example the current policy of converting to electric busses. Cost is over 2 billion, the government is putting forward 50 million. That policy alone will cost rate payers 1.95 billion or \$1000 for every household.

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](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 2:08 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners

There are two flaws in your proposal that anyone with common sense should be able to see; and even those with a (lowly) BSc in Environmental Sciences can demonstrate. I present my response to you noting that I hold this degree (UNSW, 1986).

The first is whether there is a 'climate crisis' or 'climate emergency'. The second (falsely) presumes that there is a 'climate crisis', and examines the potential impacts and benefits of implementing your proposed changes. I have limited the number of details in my submission to referencing only a few key sources, as I would hope that anyone with a scientific mind and no associated political agenda would have already sourced such information and confirmed that there is no 'climate emergency'. Unfortunately, based on the detail available in the public domain and presented by the Climate Commission, this does not appear to be the case; and the fallacy of a climate emergency continues to dominate the mainstream media and the associated political bodies such as yourselves.

#### (1) Measuring the 'Climate Emergency'

The lack of empirical evidence of warming in the past 50 years that would indicate the current global temperature increase is out of alignment with historical temperatures. I present two sources of empirical evidence for this: (a) the low level of temperature change in NIWA data; and (b) published, peer-reviewed papers examining the role of carbon in changes to global temperatures.

##### (a) Temperature Changes

I have pulled the raw data from NIWA for the longest-running temperature data sets in New Zealand. One of the longest continuous records happens to be Christchurch Gardens. These data are open-sourced and available for any of you to review. The annual mean temperature in Christchurch in 1863 was 16.5°C. By 1954, the first measurement of 17°C appeared in the records; 18°C was reached in 1981, and as of today it is 18.5°C. While the data are discontinuous in other New Zealand locations, similar low-to-moderate increases are evident in the data sets. It would therefore appear to align with the general consensus that Christchurch is warming, and has increased in mean temperature by approximately 2°C in 150 years.

However, as demonstrated in Scafetta, N. (2021, January 17). *Climate Dynamics*.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00382-021-05626-x>, the Urban Heat Island effect can be demonstrated to account for 0.5–1.5 °C. There are many other papers outlining the Urban Heat Island effect which I'm confident that you will be aware of. The point is that the temperature changes over recent decades are (1) minimal (Christchurch increase of 0.5°C from 1981 to 2021; and (2) largely able to be explained by factors other than carbon emissions.

##### (b) The correlation and causation of carbon in changes to temperature.

Common thinking presumes that because CO<sub>2</sub> is a 'greenhouse gas', an increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> will result in an increase in temperature. This is an incredibly simplistic concept, and cannot be validated by empirical data. In fact, Ice core data has revealed that the cycle of ice ages and interglacial warm periods shows CO<sub>2</sub> change lagging temperature change by several centuries to more than a millennium while modern CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature data shows lags of 9 to 12 months (Ole Humlum, Kjell Stordahl, Jan-Erik Solheim, "The phase relation between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature", *Global and Planetary Change* 100 (2013) 51-69.) T.W.



Crowther, et al (2016) "Quantifying global soil carbon losses in response to warming" Nature, Vol. 540, 104-108, 01 conducted an extensive study of global soil carbon which 'provides strong empirical support for the idea that rising temperatures will stimulate the net loss of soil carbon to the atmosphere'

(2) The proposed 'solution' prepared by the Climate Commission

Based on analysis already undertaken by the Commission's own analysis, using tools such as the Emissions Trading Scheme can ensure that New Zealand achieves 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.

From what I have read in your proposal, there will be a significant cost to central and local government and to every household in New Zealand, while the proposals will not result in lower emissions than existing policies. The current ETS has already capped emissions. If the proposals are implemented, any additional reduction will simply free up emissions in other sectors. Despite this, the Commission insists on imposing significant costs on the New Zealand economy. Our economy is currently valued at between \$200-@300B per annum. The cost of implementing will account for a huge proportion of the country's GDP for little, if any, climate benefit.

Conclusion

Being candid, your proposed policy is based on an incredibly poor and naive understanding of the science of climate and atmospheric physics. It is politically motivated, exploiting fear of climate change with the intention of driving an ideology that will have a huge impact on people's lives and the economy as a whole.

From my understanding, these proposals have been generated based on economic analyses and models that have not been made available to the public. Further, 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 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

Yours sincerely



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 7:46 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's published plan.

According to the Commission's own analysis, it is unnecessary. New Zealand is already on track to achieve its targets. Despite that, the Commission is recommending unprecedented changes to the lives and livelihoods of all New Zealanders.

Stop this madness in its tracks. If you don't it will cost you the next election and you don't deserve that.

The plan is pandering to your vanity and your uncelebrated idealism. Its author seeks to be famous at your political expense should you adopt it. And surreptitiously so.

Climate change is inevitable and unstoppable. Your responsibility is to govern for the term you were elected and as I hope you do that well for the next term and so on. This plan is outrageous and a sinister attempt to influence policy making, by exploiting fear of climate change to encourage ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy. It seeks to jump on the bandwagon of the Government's regime adopted in response to Covid threats which won the election but is now starting to wear thin in the face of economic hardships.

Covid measures won an election. This plan if adopted will lose you the next election.

I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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 my reasons given here and the detailed reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 1:19 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan. It is not worth the carbon emissions that were released into the atmosphere in order to create the paper it is printed on.

New Zealand's path to having an irrelevant and inefficient economy will surely be accelerated if any of the Commission's recommended measures are implemented.

Best you light a match to all remaining copies of the plan, and stop wasting New Zealander's time, money and oxygen.

Yours disgustedly,

[REDACTED]

Tauranga

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 3:55 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to up-end the economy with central planning in a futile effort to prevent "climate change".

The earth at various times has been "planet snowball", at other times with no polar ice caps. The earth's climate has always changed and will continue to change. Measured global warming in the modern world has been insignificant compared with natural cycles which are driven by major earth processes and variable solar activity.

There is no scientific evidence that carbon-dioxide is a forcer of climate change. The sun is the primary driving force of climate.

It is a measure of extreme hubris to believe that human activity affects climate in any material way.

The Commission's plan will result in economic hardship and ruin of the New Zealand economy for absolutely no gain.

The following article which I have presented in full describes a new climate phase, a **Modern Grand Solar Minimum** into which the world has just entered, which **will lead to decades of global cooling**, and concludes with a warning of heat and food shortages for the entire global population.

*"The reduction of a terrestrial temperature during the next 30 years can have important implications for different parts of the planet on growing vegetation, agriculture, food supplies, and heating needs in both Northern and Southern hemispheres. This global cooling during the upcoming grand solar minimum 1 (2020–2053) can offset for three decades any signs of global warming and would require inter-government efforts to tackle problems with heat and food supplies for the whole population of the Earth".*

This is not the time for New Zealand to weaken its energy supplies or ability to produce food.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Taylor

---

**Modern Grand Solar Minimum will lead to terrestrial cooling**

[Valentina Zharkova Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK](#)

In this editorial I will demonstrate with newly discovered solar activity proxy-magnetic field that the Sun has entered into the modern Grand Solar Minimum (2020–2053) that will lead to a significant reduction of solar magnetic field and activity like during Maunder minimum leading to noticeable reduction of terrestrial temperature.

Sun is the main source of energy for all planets of the solar system. This energy is delivered to Earth in a form of solar radiation in different wavelengths, called total solar irradiance. Variations of solar irradiance lead to heating of upper planetary atmosphere and complex processes of solar energy transport toward a planetary surface.

The signs of solar activity are seen in cyclic 11-year variations of a number of sunspots on the solar surface using averaged monthly sunspot numbers as a proxy of solar activity for the past 150 years. Solar cycles were described by the action of solar dynamo mechanism in the solar interior generating magnetic ropes at the bottom of solar convective zone.

These magnetic ropes travel through the solar interior appearing on the solar surface, or photosphere, as sunspots indicating the footpoints where these magnetic ropes are embedded into the photosphere.

Magnetic field of sunspots forms toroidal field while solar background magnetic field forms poloidal field. Solar dynamo cyclically converts poloidal field into toroidal one reaching its maximum at a solar cycle maximum and then the toroidal field back to the poloidal one toward a solar minimum. It is evident that for the same leading polarity of the magnetic field in sunspots in the same hemisphere the solar cycle length should be extended to 22 years.

Despite understanding the general picture of a solar cycle, it was rather difficult to match the observed sunspot numbers with the modeled ones unless the cycle is well progressed. This difficulty is a clear indication of some missing points in the definition of solar activity by sunspot numbers that turned our attention to the research of solar (poloidal) background magnetic field (SBMF) [1].

By applying Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to the low-resolution full disk magnetograms captured in cycles 21–23 by the Wilcox Solar Observatory, we discovered not one but two principal components of this solar background magnetic field (see [Figure 1](#), top plot) associated with two magnetic waves marked by red and blue lines. The authors derived mathematical formulae for these two waves fitting principal components from the data of cycles 21–23 with the series of periodic functions and used these formulae to predict these waves for cycles 24–26. These two waves are found generated in different layers of the solar interior gaining close but not equal frequencies [1]. The summary curve of these two magnetic waves ([Figure 1](#), bottom plot) reveals the interference of these waves forming maxima and minima of solar cycles.

Figure 1. Top plot: two principal components (PCs) of solar background magnetic field (blue and green curves, arbitrary numbers) obtained for cycles 21–23 (historic data) and predicted for cycles 24–26 using the mathematical formulae derived from the historical data (from the data by Zharkova et al. [1]). The bottom plot: The summary curve derived from the two PCs above for the “historical” data (cycles 21–23) and predicted for solar cycle 24 (2008–2019), cycle 25 (2020–2031), cycle 26 (2031–2042) (from the data by Zharkova et al. [1]).

[Display full size](#)

The summary curve of two magnetic waves explains many features of 11-year cycles, like double maxima in some cycles, or asymmetry of the solar activity in the opposite hemispheres during different cycles. Zharkova et al. [1] linked the modulus summary curve to the averaged sunspot numbers for cycles 21–23 as shown in [Figure 2](#) (top plot) and extended this curve to cycles 24–26 as shown in [Figure 2](#) (bottom plot). It appears that the amplitude of the summary solar magnetic field shown in the summary curve is reducing toward cycles 24–25 becoming nearly zero in cycle 26.

Figure 2. Top plot: The modulus summary curve (black curve) obtained from the summary curve ([Figure 1](#), bottom plot) versus the averaged sunspot numbers (red curve) for the historical data (cycles 21–23). Bottom plot: The modulus summary curve associated with the sunspot numbers derived for cycles 21–23 (and calculated for cycles 24–26 (built from the data obtained by Zharkova et al. [1])).

[Display full size](#)

Zharkova et al. [1] suggested to use the summary curve as a new proxy of solar activity, which utilizes not only amplitude of a solar cycle but also its leading magnetic polarity of solar magnetic field.

Figure 3. Solar activity (summary) curve restored for 1200–3300 AD (built from the data obtained by Zharkova et al. [1]).

[Display full size](#)

[Figure 3](#) presents the summary curve calculated with the derived mathematical formulae forwards for 1200 years and backwards 800 years. This curve reveals appearance of Grand Solar Cycles of 350–400 years caused by the interference of two magnetic waves. These grand cycles are separated by the grand solar minima, or the periods of very low solar activity [1]. The previous grand solar minimum was Maunder minimum (1645–1710), and the other one before named Wolf minimum (1270–1350). As seen in [Figure 3](#) from prediction by Zharkova et al. [1], in the next 500 years there are two modern grand solar minima approaching in the Sun: the modern one in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (2020–2053) and the second one in the 24<sup>th</sup> century (2370–2415).

The observational properties of the two magnetic waves and their summary curve were closely fit by double dynamo waves generated by dipole magnetic sources in two layers of the solar interior: inner and outer layers [1], while other three pairs of magnetic waves can be produced by quadruple, sextuple, and octuple magnetic sources altogether with dipole source defining the visible appearance of solar activity on the surface.

Currently, the Sun has completed solar cycle 24 – the weakest cycle of the past 100+ years – and in 2020, has started cycle 25. During the periods of low solar activity, such as the modern grand solar minimum, the Sun will often be devoid of sunspots. This is what is observed now at the start of this minimum, because in 2020 the Sun has seen, in total, 115 spotless days (or 78%), meaning 2020 is on track to surpass the space-age record of 281 spotless days (or 77%) observed in 2019. However, the cycle 25 start is still slow in firing active regions and flares, so with every extra day/week/month that passes, the null in solar activity is extended marking a start of grand solar minimum. What are the consequences for Earth of this decrease of solar activity?

## Total solar irradiance (TSI) reduction during Maunder Minimum

Let us explore what has happened with the solar irradiance during the previous grand solar minimum – Maunder Minimum. During this period, very few sunspots appeared on the surface of the Sun, and the overall brightness of the Sun was slightly decreased.

The reconstruction of the cycle-averaged solar total irradiance back to 1610 ([Figure 4](#), top plot) suggests a decrease of the solar irradiance during Maunder minimum by a value of about 3 W/m<sup>2</sup> [2], or about 0.22% of the total solar irradiance in 1710, after the Maunder minimum was over.

## Temperature decrease during Maunder minimum

From 1645 to 1710, the temperatures across much of the Northern Hemisphere of the Earth plunged when the Sun entered a quiet phase now called the Maunder Minimum. This likely occurred because the total solar irradiance was reduced by 0.22%, shown in [Figure 4](#) (top plot) [2], that led to a decrease of the average terrestrial temperature measured mainly in the Northern hemisphere in Europe by 1.0–1.5°C as shown in [Figure 4](#) (bottom plot) [3]. This seemingly small decrease of the average temperature in the Northern hemisphere led to frozen rivers, cold long winters, and cold summers.

Figure 4. Top plot: restored total solar irradiance from 1600 until 2014 by Lean et al. [2]. Modified by Easterbrook [3], from Lean, Beer, Bradley [2]. Bottom plot: Central England temperatures (CET) recorded continuously since 1658. Blue areas are reoccurring cool periods; red areas are warm periods. All times of solar minima were coincident with cool periods in central England. Adopted from Easterbrook [3], with the Elsevier publisher permissions.

The surface temperature of the Earth was reduced all over the Globe (see [Figure 1](#) in [4]), especially, in the countries of Northern hemisphere. Europe and North America went into a deep freeze: alpine glaciers extended over valley

farmland; sea ice crept south from the Arctic; Dunab and Thames rivers froze regularly during these years as well as the famous canals in the Netherlands.

Shindell et al. [4] have shown that the drop in the temperature was related to dropped abundances of ozone created by solar ultra-violet light in the stratosphere, the layer of the atmosphere located between 10 and 50 kilometers from the Earth's surface. Since during the Maunder Minimum the Sun emitted less radiation, in total, including strong ultraviolet emission, less ozone was formed affecting planetary atmosphere waves, the giant wiggles in the jet stream.

Shindell et al. [4] in p. 2150 suggest that "a change to the planetary waves during the Maunder Minimum kicked the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) – the balance between a permanent low-pressure system near Greenland and a permanent high-pressure system to its south – into a negative phase, that led to Europe to remain unusually cold during the MM."

## Role of magnetic field in terrestrial cooling in Grand Solar Minima

However, not only solar radiation was changed during Maunder minimum. There is another contributor to the reduction of terrestrial temperature during Maunder minimum – this is the solar background magnetic field, whose role has been overlooked so far. After the discovery [1] of a significant reduction of magnetic field in the upcoming modern grand solar minimum and during Maunder minimum, the solar magnetic field was recognized to control the level of cosmic rays reaching planetary atmospheres of the solar system, including the Earth. A significant reduction of the solar magnetic field during grand solar minima will undoubtedly lead to the increase of intensity of galactic and extra-galactic cosmic rays, which, in turn, lead to a formation of high clouds in the terrestrial atmospheres and assist to atmospheric cooling as shown by Svensmark et al. [[a href="https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23328940.2020.1796243" data-bbox="57 425 854 469">data-rid="cit0005" data-reflink="\\_i10">5](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23328940.2020.1796243)].

In the previous solar minimum between cycles 23 and 24, the cosmic ray intensity increased by 19%. Currently, solar magnetic field predicted in [Figure 1](#) by Zharkova et al. [1] is radically dropping in the sun that, in turn, leads to a sharp decline in the sun's interplanetary magnetic field down to only 4 nanoTesla (nT) from typical values of 6 to 8 nT. This decrease of interplanetary magnetic field naturally leads to a significant increase of the intensity of cosmic rays passing to the planet's atmospheres as reported by the recent space missions [6]. Hence, this process of solar magnetic field reduction is progressing as predicted by Zharkova et al. [1], and its contribution will be absorbed by the planetary atmospheres including Earth. This can decrease the terrestrial temperature during the modern grand solar minimum that has already started in 2020.

## Expected reduction of terrestrial temperature in modern Grand Solar Minima

This summary curve also indicated the upcoming modern grand solar minimum 1 in cycles 25–27 (2020–2053) and modern grand solar minimum 2 (2370–2415). This will bring to the modern times the unique low activity conditions of the Sun, which occurred during Maunder minimum. It is expected that during the modern grand solar minimum, the solar activity will be reduced significantly as this happened during Maunder minimum ([Figure 4](#), bottom plot). Similarly to Maunder Minimum, as discussed above, the reduction of solar magnetic field will cause a decrease of solar irradiance by about 0.22% for a duration of three solar cycles (25–27) for the first modern grand minimum (2020–2053) and four solar cycles from the second modern grand minimum (2370–2415).

This, in turn, can lead to a drop of the terrestrial temperature by up to 1.0°C from the current temperature during the next three cycles (25–27) of grand minimum 1. The largest temperature drops will be approaching during the local minima between cycles 25 – 26 and cycles 26–27 when the lowest solar activity level is achieved using the estimations in [Figure 2](#) (bottom plot) and [Figure 3](#). Therefore, the average temperature in the Northern hemisphere can be reduced by up to 1.0°C from the current temperature, which was increased by 1.4°C since Maunder minimum. This will result in the average temperature to become lower than the current one to be only 0.4°C higher than the temperature measured in 1710. Then, after the modern grand solar minimum 1 is over, the solar activity in

cycle 28 will be restored to normal in the rather short but powerful grand solar cycle lasting between 2053 and 2370, as shown in [Figure 3](#), before it approaches the next grand solar minimum 2 in 2370.

## Conclusions

In this editorial, I have demonstrated that the recent progress with understanding a role of the solar background magnetic field in defining solar activity and with quantifying the observed magnitudes of magnetic field at different times allowed us to enable reliable long-term prediction of solar activity on a millennium timescale. This approach revealed a presence of not only 11-year solar cycles but also of grand solar cycles with duration of 350–400 years. We demonstrated that these grand cycles are formed by the interferences of two magnetic waves with close but not equal frequencies produced by the double solar dynamo action at different depths of the solar interior. These grand cycles are always separated by grand solar minima of Maunder minimum type, which regularly occurred in the past forming well-known Maunder, Wolf, Oort, Homeric, and other grand minima.

During these grand solar minima, there is a significant reduction of solar magnetic field and solar irradiance, which impose the reduction of terrestrial temperatures derived for these periods from the analysis of terrestrial biomass during the past 12,000 or more years. The most recent grand solar minimum occurred during Maunder Minimum (1645–1710), which led to reduction of solar irradiance by 0.22% from the modern one and a decrease of the average terrestrial temperature by 1.0–1.5°C.

This discovery of double dynamo action in the Sun brought us a timely warning about the upcoming grand solar minimum 1, when solar magnetic field and its magnetic activity will be reduced by 70%. This period has started in the Sun in 2020 and will last until 2053. During this modern grand minimum, one would expect to see a reduction of the average terrestrial temperature by up to 1.0°C, especially, during the periods of solar minima between the cycles 25–26 and 26–27, e.g. in the decade 2031–2043.

The reduction of a terrestrial temperature during the next 30 years can have important implications for different parts of the planet on growing vegetation, agriculture, food supplies, and heating needs in both Northern and Southern hemispheres. This global cooling during the upcoming grand solar minimum 1 (2020–2053) can offset for three decades any signs of global warming and would require inter-government efforts to tackle problems with heat and food supplies for the whole population of the Earth.

## References

1. ZharkovaVV, ShepherdSJ, PopovaE, et al. Heartbeat of the sun from principal component analysis and prediction of solar activity on a millennium timescale. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:15689. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep15689> [Crossref], [PubMed], [Web of Science®], [Google Scholar]
2. LeanJL, BeerJ, BradleyReconstruction of solar irradiance since 1610: implications for climatic change. *Geophys Res Lett.* 1995;22:3195–3198. [Crossref], [Web of Science®], [Google Scholar]
3. EasterbrookCause of global climate changes. In: *Evidence-based climate science.* 2nd ed. Elsevier Inc.; 2016. p. 245–262. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
4. ShindellDT, SchmidtGA, MannME, et al. Solar forcing of regional climate change during the Maunder minimum. *Science.* 2001;294:2149. [Crossref], [PubMed], [Web of Science®], [Google Scholar]
5. SvensmarkH, EnghoffMB, ShavivNJ, et al. Increased ionization supports growth of aerosols into cloud condensation nuclei. *Nat Comms.* 2017;8:2199. [Crossref], [PubMed], [Web of Science®], [Google Scholar]
6. SchwadronNA, RahmanifardF, WilsonJ, et al. Update on the worsening particle radiation environment observed by CRaTER and implications for future human deep-space exploration. *Space Weather.* 2018;16:289–303. [Crossref], [Web of Science®], [Google Scholar]

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23328940.2020.1796243>



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 5:46 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose any implementation of the Climate Change Commission's recommendations without considering the danger of lowering the planet's CO2 levels.

At the end of the previous glaciation the amount of carbon dioxide left in the atmosphere had decreased to 180ppm (parts per million).

All plants starve to death at 150ppm.

The terrestrial biosphere was already well along the curve to total extinction. Plants were starving and struggling with drought. The recent greening of the planet (particularly regions like the Sahel) is due to the moderate increase in atmospheric CO2.

However, the present levels of carbon dioxide are still unusually and dangerously low. Another serious glaciation could end all life on Earth, as cooling oceans absorb CO2. We're still in the current Ice Age and no one can guarantee that the glaciers won't spread again.

It would be ignorant and short sighted to destroy New Zealand's economy in pursuit of a goal that might well destroy more than human lives.

Otherwise, I endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission) and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Strongly Disagree; Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 March 2021 6:26 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To the Climate Change Commissioners

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's plans for the transformation of our economy. It seems to me that the Commission's own analysis shows that New Zealand will achieve net zero emissions using existing tools such as the ETS and there is no need for the huge changes proposed to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders, which I can't help noticing will have the greatest impact on Government's political opponents. As I understand it, the proposals will not result in lower emissions than existing policies but simply free up emissions in other sectors.

I do not believe the Commission's claims that the proposed plan will only cost 1% of GDP, which is patently implausible. I believe the plan should be dropped and re-formulated with far more openness around the modelling so that it can be properly evaluated by independent economists.

As regards the Commission's six key questions, I respond as follows:

1. I do not agree that the emissions budgets proposed would put New Zealand on course to meeting 2050 emissions targets because the ETS already has us on such a course.
2. I do not agree that you have struck a fair balance but rather one that is punitive. The focus should be on achieving our NDCs at least cost and disruption.
3. I think anyone who thinks they know what NDCs are needed to lead to a particular temperature rise goal are putting excessive faith in the models.
4. I do not agree that growing native forests as a long-term carbon store is the best way to lock up carbon, there are faster growing trees and the decisions should be left to the ETS, not government direction.
5. I do not believe that any of the Commission's proposals are urgently needed to meet our emissions budgets.
6. I believe the path to 2035 is over-reliant on government direction and compulsion and, if achieved, will do so with more disruption to people's lives than is necessary.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 8:16 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's central planning approach.

This enforces someone else's ideas of the way to do something on an inventive and educated nation of people who are very likely to have better ideas than some bureaucrat or scientist who is paid to agree with their approach.

There are many, many things which Kiwis enjoy, not least a BBQ that have such a miniscule effect on climate that regulations are just nonsense. For example, coal fired steam trains, classic and favorite old cars and motorcycles, small aircraft, bonfires, fireplaces and wood burners are all part of a quality like for some people. You could hardly measure the effect removing these joys will have in terms of climate change.

Instead, we should focus on things which ACTUALLY help the climate and pollution, by building local recycling plants, removing traffic lights, banning car parks in government buildings for employees and requiring that all government employees and politicians HAVE to use public transport unless disabled permanently or temporarily.

There are so many examples of EXISTING ideas being used abroad that add to safety and quality of life whilst ALSO reducing emissions, but dropping a pile of regulations on people is not the way to do it; if you look where we are succeeding as a nation, it is NOT from central government, it is individual ideas.

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 endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission) and register my feedback to your six "key questions" as Strongly disagree; Strongly disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree; None of them; and Strongly disagree — for the reasons set out the Taxpayers' Union submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 22 March 2021 7:55 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To the Commissioners,

The draconian measures proposed by the Climate Change Commission is a blatant "power grab" designed to support a United (Socialist) Nations agenda. Further, by the Commission's own determination and that of the same UN, such measures are unnecessary if a country has an effective Emissions Trading Scheme. The Government has already been advised that the time scale and cost of upgrading the electrical grid to support everything electrical is monumental and ill-advised.

The Commission, together with its report should be scrapped. The Government should take a realistic and responsible approach to the administration of the existing ETS.

Consequently, I generally support the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 21 March 2021 9:36 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose the Climate Change Commission's unnecessary plan to destroy the economy.

Under the plan, New Zealand will become a third world economy in a matter of years. It will kill Taranaki, one of New Zealand's highest GDP producers. The province will become a rural wasteland through the proposed reforms to farming and the downstream oil and gas sector.

The global energy mix will still require about 40% hydrocarbons in 2050 and New Zealand should be allowed to continue to develop these resources for the benefit of the economy. Domestic gas is an ideal fuel to underpin the unreliability of renewables in that it is cleaner burning than imported coal from Indonesia (although just about anything is, of course), currently being burnt at Huntly at over a megaton per year.

Has the commission really considered what the proposed changes to the small vehicle fleet proposed will mean? What will the recycling costs of batteries be? the average kiwi be able to afford an EV? Will the global demand for battery components and rare earth metals even be sustainable beyond 2035? I am highly skeptical that the wholesale ban on diesel and petrol vehicles will work out for "New Zealand Inc".

As a worker in the upstream oil and gas industry, I am deeply concerned that insufficient thought has been put in to government policymaking in this area. The solution of pumped hydro (i.e. Lake Onslow) is also acknowledged by personnel working in MBIE's renewables division as being a very imperfect solution for dry-year renewable electricity supply, given that it will store water drawn from an already low central Otago water table into a high altitude reservoir, before being eventually turned into hydroelectricity. It will stagnate, silt up and fill with algae and become a cesspool from which the proposed gains in dry year power generation capacity will never be realised.

The government needs to look outside the narrow box they have set as boundaries for themselves regarding energy policy. How hard would it be to allow gas discoveries to be developed with generation facilities at the field, with integral carbon sequestration? The emissions from such a development would end up being pretty much ZERO from such a development. It would allow exploration for hydrocarbons to continue and keep the industry going, something the country's economy, and the government, needs to happen to avoid New Zealand falling into the crater the commission's report has opened up for us. The commission's report is an economic suicide note.

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 (Labour and Greens have a track record of opaque consultation, if they even consult of course - examples include the oil and gas exploration ban and tranches 1 and 2 of Arms Act reforms) 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](http://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,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 21 March 2021 12:39 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I support the Climate Change Commission's necessary plan.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 20 March 2021 7:29 am  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I support the Climate Change Commission's plan to change the economy with central planning to combat climate change.

New Zealand is far behind a track to achieve net zero emissions and it needs to do so. The Commission is demanding enormous changes to the lives and livelihoods of New Zealanders and it is a change we need to make!

Any reductions from regulation (such as from banning gas connections or forcing a transition to electric vehicles) must not simply free up emissions in other sectors. (i.e. the 'waterbed effect'). We need to ensure that measures we are undertaking are studied under EROEI principles so they are effective in what we need.

The Commission must ensure that lower emissions in sectors covered by the ETS do not result result in an equal increase in emissions elsewhere in the economy.

I believe many people, and especially younger people will support the costs incurred – likely in the hundreds of billions over time in the traditional economic sense – for climate benefit. The ideologically-driven changes to people's lives and the economy are needed in many ways. Environmentally and economically to assist inequality that is currently occurring.

Having access to the economic modelling behind the Commission's forecasts would be good, but we need to accept that the economic system is very much part of the problems we face and needs to be changed - probably radically.

New Zealanders can be expected to support a plan to reshape our lives by being upfront and honest about the trade-offs.

The plan should be continued!

I do not endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate_submission) as I believe they take little heed of the threat humanity is facing and foisting on all other organisms; and will be shown to be eventually unsupportable.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** [REDACTED] <action@campaignnow.co>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 March 2021 3:59 pm  
**To:** Hello - Climate Commission  
**Subject:** Submission on "Climate Action for Aotearoa" draft advice

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly oppose the Climate Change Commission's plan to waste precious resources opposing something that they cannot stop, and is not even happening anywhere near the scale they believe it is.

While there is some evidence the earth has warmed over the last century this is not necessarily a bad thing. Co2 fertilisation has caused significant increased greening over recent decades and combined with an increase in temperature will improve the lives of many millions of people.

There is a growing number of scientists willing to speak out against the myth that there is a supposed consensus supporting man made climate change. This myth has only been allowed to survive due to the cackle culture that pervades modern society, with any scientist not towing the line at risk of losing their funding due to a media and government presence that is not willing to even consider alternatives.

There is significant evidence that historical temperature records are being manipulated to show a warming trend when there is none. These agencies claim that they are correcting past errors, yet they always seem to make the past colder, creating a warming trend. When even faking the data does not do it, they instead cherry pick their starting year to make it look like a warming trend, by picking the coldest period to start from.

Even if all the above is wrong and we really are significantly warming the planet and CO2 really does have a massive effect on temperature, the cost of adapting to this is orders of magnitude smaller than the cost of trying to prevent the CO2 emissions in the first place. Funds should instead go towards research into crops with better drought resistance, or gradually moving new builds away from low lying areas (as even the most alarmist predictions give us many decades to do so).

Not a single major climate prediction of the last 30 years has come true, yet the media still repeats them, they still claim we are at or beyond the tipping point and life as we know it will end.

Even the IPCC reports state that extreme weather events have not increased, yet every time there is a storm somewhere in the world (pretty much at any point in time there is one somewhere) this gets trotted out as evidence of climate change, despite endless evidence, even from the IPCC, that this is not the case. This does not stop the lies and fear mongering by the worlds media.

While removing CO2 may make some people feel better about themselves, NZ could be removed from the map and global emissions would not be dented, in fact they would likely go up, as other countries with less efficient processes would be forced to generate the resources that we currently produce.

The fact that the commission will not release the full modelling data is very much in line with other so called climate scientists around the world. No true scientist would fear others reviewing their work, and no true scientist would so deliberately pick and manipulate their data to fit their predetermined outcome.

The plan, and the commission itself should be scrapped.

I also endorse the submission made by the Taxpayers' Union and available at [www.taxpayers.org.nz/climate\\_submission](http://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.

Regards,