

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Dr Nick Bradford M.A (Cantab) FRNZCGP etc

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

That NZ sets a more ambitious target that is in line with the EU and other OECD countries' targets of 15-40 % below 1990 levels, to give the world a better chance of keeping closer to the 2 degrees C limit for global warming. Doing any less would make NZ a pariah on the international stage, it's target of a 5% reduction is pathetic. NZ badly needs a government that has some guts and a vision for the long term future of NZ and the World that is vigorously debated in NZ. We owe it to future generations to be less selfish, the government needs to be less concerned with petty personal politics, and more committed to change.

What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

2. What do you think the nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means for the level of target that we set?

Irrespective of our mix of GHG emissions we are still the 5th highest emitters per capita. The target of 5% below 1990 levels is too low.

1) It is almost certain that trying to reduce methane production per stock unit will bring no meaningful reduction to the agricultural sector, particularly when we have such a weak Emissions Trading Scheme that has allowed such cheap carbon units to be traded in NZ that there has been a rapid felling of pine forests and a rapid increase in dairy numbers in NZ. This increase in dairy herds will offset any possible reduction in methane per stock unit that any research may come up with.

2) We need a FISCALLY NEUTRAL CARBON TAX to be introduced. You only have to look at the 50,000 hectares of pine forest in the central North Island that have been destroyed in the last few years to form more dairy farms, to see that the 'weak as watered down green top milk ETS' needs to be scrapped, and a FISCALLY NEUTRAL CARBON TAX. Introduced at a low level for ALL emitters with set targets for increasing the tax over time. This will give

- a) More certainty for emitters and more transparency for the public
- b) More certainty for those investing in schemes to reduce GHG emissions
- c) More certainty that forests that are our GHG sinks will not be cut down for yet more dairy farms

But the present government has not so far had the guts to bring this in.

3) The Government needs to do more to reduce fossil fuel import and consumption

- a) by increasing the tax on fuel and petrol driven vehicles, as has been done in Norway
- b) using the funds provided by this tax to pay for increased public transport, and to subsidise the uptake of electric and hybrid vehicles. This would save NZ up to \$2 Billion in imported fuel costs, which would help balance our current trade deficit.

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



Copy of your submission

DO NOT FORGET that the economy is a human construction that can be changed, but we have to live within the laws of nature, THE LAWS OF NATURE CANNOT BE CHANGED.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

If a Fiscally Neutral Carbon Tax is introduced, much of the tax paid to the government by emitters can be passed back to low income families by raising the limit on which tax is applied to income i.e. having the first \$14,000 of income tax free. This would offset any increase in costs of fuel and food for that most vulnerable group, while those who can afford to consume more would pay more. This would be fairer and would help reduce the increasing inequality in NZ society.

4. Of the opportunities for New Zealand to reduce its emissions (as outlined on page 15 of the discussion document), which do you think are the most likely to occur, or be most important for New Zealand?

A Fiscally Neutral Carbon Tax could

- 1) Increase our forest sinks
- 2) Partly be used to subsidise increased public transport and the introduction of more electric and hybrid cars
- 3) Subsidise the production in NZ of biofuels from whey and woody forest wastes

Summary

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

Do not rely on the uncertain hope that reduction in methane emissions from cattle will occur from the research currently being done.

Do rely on increasing the availability of public transport and the known technologies of electric vehicles and hybrids to reduce our GHG emissions, and to reduce our fossil fuel imports.

Do rely on the known technologies of biofuel production to reduce our GHG emissions from vehicles.

Do rely on a Carbon Tax to reduce cutting down of our forest sinks, and even increasing our pine forest sinks to offset GHG production from the agricultural sector

Other comments

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

YES, it is high time the current National Government had the guts to introduce meaningful measures to

- 1) Increase our target for GHG emission reduction to 15% or more below the 1990 level to help the world avoid the very worst of global warming effects, that will devastate future generations
- 2) regularly discuss with the media and the public the importance of introducing the policies such as those I have outlined above
- 3) lift politics out of the current despond of personal attacks, to the level of discussion needed to frame a future vision for NZ and how to attain it.