

## Andrew Hollis

1 Who am I...I'm a geologist, I have been studying the Earth and its systems for years. For me the spectre of human caused climate change reared its head in 1990.

NZ has been heading down a pathway with closed eyes and closed minds with regards to the climate. The latest is the Paris Accords where we will apparently beggar ourselves to kowtow to the UN.

It also seems that farmers will bear the brunt of changes to tax rules to try and pay for our commitments.

However, it appears that farmers far from being responsible for emitting CO2 may well be New Zealand's best absorbers. The accounting our government uses for CO2 emissions does not include grassland or fruit trees. It turns out that untilled grassland absorbs nearly as much as pine plantations per hectare. AND it can keep doing it beyond the life of a pine tree...

Grassland binds soil together where as soil is literally destroyed

No allowance is made for native plantings which are often the makeup of riparian planting.

Its almost as if there is an agenda at play here.

All of this and it also looks as though CO2 is not the villain it has been made out to be. Not one climate model based on the thermostat model of CO2 concentration works within cooee of reality. Climate models use a thing called parameterisation for all of the hard to measure pieces of the puzzle...water vapour being one you know...clouds. Many other authors call this fudging. The process uses a technique called hind casting which always brings the model up to date historically and then fails to match reality going forward in much the same way that financial models can tell us after a stock market crash what went wrong but have never accurately predicted any future movements.

By the way the methane emitted by livestock is 6% of the carbon consumed by the animal. The remainder is returned to the earth or into the animal in the form of urine, manure, milk, wool, steak or any other number of products but not methane. In horticulture, how much CO2 does it take to make an olive, avocado, kiwifruit or grape? All carbon trapped and not released by the orchardist and yet no accounting made for it.

Here is the fun bit...the methane emitted is from sugars made by grass which took CO2 from the atmosphere. No new carbon added...none. And 94% of the total is removed from the atmosphere. It is possible to show that farming and horticulture in New Zealand is not only carbon neutral but is likely to be a carbon sink.

The only time a farm releases carbon is upon tilling the soil. You know ... to plant soy for bio fuels as an example.

Importantly, if CO2 is doing little to nothing to warm our planet then how on earth is this anything to do with farmers? At the moment 87% of NZ is living in cities all using cars, buses and SUVs to get around and yet are also the ones baying for farmers to clean the planet?

In short there seems to be a push to make farming so expensive that land will be freed up to have pine plantations planted upon arable land. This will ruin the soil structure, allow massive amounts of NZ soil to run off and release mega tonnes of carbon in the coming decades at the cost of NZers.

Please push back with the information that farms are net sinks of carbon. Let's get the carbon accounting accurate and honest and don't pay anything for climate mitigation.

Time to end the guilt

Time to stop blaming farmers

Time to realise that the heating humans are causing is almost entirely related to the increase number living in cities and the huge energy spent within.

CO2 is not the problem, farmers are not the problem, New Zealand's agriculture and horticulture are not the culprit, in fact New Zealand is likely to be already better than carbon zero right now. Just do the maths right and stop blaming farmers