

Mar 16, 2023

The comment below was posted at the following link. You are asked to post your own Comment(s) Submission and invite others to do the same.

<https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2022/2022-12-31/html/reg1-eng.html>

March 11.23

To whom it may concern, the Minister of Environment, et al,

"I utterly oppose the stringent measures you are wanting to enact to get to the goal of ZERO emissions by 2050 for three reasons:

1. There are a heck of a lot of people who fall below the poverty line and cannot afford any sort of new vehicle, much less ones such as the ZEV proposed vehicles that have zero emissions. This strategy will surely push such people into further poverty while allowing the true polluters of our planet - ie industry - to carry on much the same as usual (as for Big Business sucking up some Carbon Taxes will barely make a dent in their profit margins), and will push people into the proposed Smart and 15 Minute Cities when they are no longer allowed to drive their gas or diesel cars and trucks. These Smart Cities are embedded with smart sensors everywhere, surveillance cameras everywhere, and increasingly limited freedoms in a place that offers virtually no beauty or quiet or nature anywhere.

2. There were much higher levels of Carbon Dioxide and greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere millions of years ago. Life absolutely THRIVED with an incredible and rich diversity of flora and fauna. Plants NEED CO2 to thrive (which is why many plant nurseries actually INJECT CO2 into their greenhouses). And all human and animal life in one way or another depend on the oxygen that is released from healthy trees and plants, as well as the nourishment and pollen that plants provide. If plants and trees don't get enough Carbon Dioxide, we too will suffer the consequences.

3. The whole climate change narrative which is based, so we're told, on "settled science", does not take into account decades of climate and weather modification activities that have been carried out around the globe by various governments. Science has never proved that increased severity of storms is caused by a 1 deg C rise in temperature, but it is probable that geoengineering and weather modification activities actually and actively DO have a very real effect on weather, climate, and intensity of storms - see this 1997 World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Archived Registry of hundreds of weather modification activities being carried out by governments round the globe: https://climateviewer.com/2018/1997-1998-WMO-Register-of-National-Weather-Modification-Projects-wmo-td_1001.pdf . This is just one report of dozens, as these yearly WMO archived documents go back to 1975. The 1966 NASA document *A National Recommended Program in Weather Modification* outlines a national strategy involving about a dozen prominent US agencies including the DoD, DoT, FAA, NSF, NASA, and others, indicating that this ongoing alteration of our weather does indeed go back half a century:

<https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/19680002906/downloads/19680002906.pdf>

And the 1997 US Air Force document *Weather as a Force Multiplier - Owning the Weather in 2025* indicates that this kind of activity continues to be ongoing. A massive US Senate investigative Report on the subject offers evidence that this kind of activity actually goes back to the 1950's: <https://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/massive-us-senate-document-on-national-and-global-weather-modification/>

To destroy Canada's economy in order to achieve reduction in gases that the planet actually needs for it's very survival - ie CO2 which is literally the backbone of life itself - is insanity. The UN SDG's and policies such as this will eventually result in increased travel restrictions, increased gas and carbon taxation, energy and fuel rationing, and it is certain that such policies will eventually lead to a hugely decreased economy (and could even contribute to an outright economic collapse), and pose a great threat to our Civil Liberties. So it appears to me that the goal of those behind all such policy, IS actually to cripple economy all over the world, perhaps even to cause an economic collapse, so that a Central Bank Digital Currency and the connected Digital Identity ([https://canada-ca.github.io/PCTF-CCP/docs/2020-08-08%20Digital-ID-General-with-CIOSC-Standard-Draft%20\(EN\).pdf](https://canada-ca.github.io/PCTF-CCP/docs/2020-08-08%20Digital-ID-General-with-CIOSC-Standard-Draft%20(EN).pdf)) may be imposed on the world's people, thus ensuring compliance to policies that are falsely based on skewed science (ie not including decades of deliberate engineering and altering of weather and climate through geoengineering and weather modification activities, and not including science that includes the natural variables in climate over millennia. We are in fact coming out of a mini Ice Age just now, so the warming of the earth is a natural & wellcome outcome). This policy and others like it appear to be more about complete technocratic surveillance, digitization, and control, than about saving the planet...

If we want to save the planet, may I suggest saving the last remaining 2% of Old Growth forest in BC & other critical forests round the world with an immediate moratorium on all further logging of old growth trees - these gentle giants exhale the very oxygen we all need for our survival; in getting the plastics out of the ocean; stopping the insane weather & climate modification activities that have slowly been poisoning our planet and wreaking havoc with the weather; cleaning the pollutants such as aluminum, barium, lead, tin, strontium, and other contaminants out of our air supply, water, and soil (I had collected rainwater in the pristine Kootenays of BC and had it tested in 2013. It came back "unsafe to drink". Thousands of such tests have been done around the world all indicating that there is a terrible amount of pollution in the air that comes down in our rain, and is slowly poisoning all life; The above noted weather and climate modification activity actually involves the release of the same kinds of chemicals that are being found in many rain and snow samples around the world - notably aluminum, barium, lead, tin, etc. (contrary to what we have been told, these experiments are FIELD experiments, not lab or computer generated data).

I doubt very much that public input will truly be considered in any policy enacted, unless it parrots the narrative that we have been told ad nauseum by media and

government for some years now. And contrary to what these same agencies are telling us, the science is NOT settled. There are literally tens of thousands of scientists, geologists, and other such earth related science specialists that DO NOT accept this narrative. But they are shut out of the decision making process by denying them grants, censoring their reports, and not allowing them to participate in the IPCC and other such Climate related, policy making processes - see <https://www.technocracy.news/climate-scientists-write-to-un-there-is-no-climate-emergency/>

AND experts seeking to exit the climate alarm policies being enacted round the globe: <http://clexit.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/clexit-members.pdf> AND this excellent overview of science that proves Climate Change to be a natural cyclic phenomenon: <https://pullnews.medium.com/what-i-learned-about-climate-change-the-science-is-not-settled-1e3ae4712ace> AND this petition signed on to by 32,000 science related experts stating that the KYOTO Protocol, through its removal of Carbon Dioxide from our atmosphere, is actually endangering life: <https://www.sott.net/article/170664-32000-Global-Warming-Deniers?ysclid=lf052h29pr437674431>

I hope you all can live with yourselves for skewing facts by not including in ANY climate science investigation, activities such as geoengineering and weather and climate modification which in all likelihood have more to do with the increased severity of storms, floods, and droughts we're seeing today, than what we are being told is the reason for it (ie Carbon Dioxide and a 1 degree alteration of temperature). Spraying tons of aluminum and other chemicals into the atmosphere most certainly is responsible for a great deal of the pollution and resulting species die-offs we're seeing today.

Thus I reject any climate science informing policy that does not include close scrutiny of the weather and climate altering activities that have been global in scope and ongoing for over half a century by governments around the world.

Please send me a note acknowledging receipt of my input.

Thank you,
Juscha Grunther