

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 185

Submitter Type:

Clause

1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

Position

The Government sets a 2050 target in legislation now

Notes

Anything other than a legislated target is not in accordance with the scientific consensus

Clause

2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

Position

Net Zero Emissions - Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050

Notes

Anything other than this target is not in accordance with the scientific consensus

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

No country will have emissions to spare. The science dictates that all countries need to be emissions free by the second half of the century. If carbon units are bought off of foreign countries, policy should be put in place to ensure that the country the permit is bought from is tracking to meet their climate targets. At this stage there is not a single country in the world even close to this. Buying units is at this stage is a mute point. The reductions required by each country are so steep that nobody will have units to sell. We SHOULD NOT be relying on this. We need to reduce our emissions urgently - that is what the science says

Clause

4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Only if credible scientific evidence suggests this should be the case. This would be akin to finding evidence that contradicts the consensus that smoking causes cancer. Extremely unlikely

Clause

5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

Position

No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed

Notes**Clause**

7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under exceptional circumstances? See p36 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

If and only if credible scientific evidence suggests this should be the case. This would be akin to finding evidence that contradicts the consensus that smoking causes cancer. Extremely unlikely

Clause

8. Do you agree with the considerations we propose that the Government and the Climate Change Commission take into account when advising on and setting budgets? See p44 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

Broadly speaking yes. However more weight needs to be given to the science. Physics will win over economics. At some stage hard decisions will need to be made. A drop in living standards looks likely if the science is followed. We must follow the science

Clause

9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely crucial. We must be tracking to timeframes. Severe penalties must be in put in place if we are off target

Clause

10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?

Notes

Honest communication with media and the wider public. Despite the political spin, a 10% reduction in emissions each year on the previous year is not an opportunity. It will require a drop in living standards for high income earners and most people. There is no way around this. Business and high income earners need to be educated on this. Airlines (Air NZ) needs to be advised that it's business is finished in 31 years (it seems unlikely that the jet engine will be replaced anytime soon). Has this discussion been had?

Clause

11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions? See p42 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Position

Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

Notes

Clause

13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise? See p45 Our Climate Your Say

Notes

Yes but as per above - the science needs to dictate all outcomes. I would propose that climate scientists have the final say on any decisions made

Clause

14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?

Position

No

Notes

Do not over complicate it or detract from its central goal - reducing emissions

Clause

15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? See p47 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but again they should not detract from the central goal - to reduce emissions. Adaption should not replace reduction

Clause

16. Should we explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

Notes

We have committed to being emissions free by 2050 and I commend the courage to do this (bearing in mind the science shows us that this will only leave us with an outside chance of reaching 2 degrees). To be emissions free we are looking at about 10% reductions per year. Has the magnitude of this task been mapped out in terms of carbon budgets for each individual in New Zealand? Starting from next year, people need to be emissions free for 1 month a year; this means no flying, driving or creating emissions from food, power, water, heating. Do people realise this? I think the government needs to be honest with the public, 10% reductions per year are probably not compatible with a growing economy. This issue is something we have not historically had to deal with on a global scale. It is unprecedented and therefore requires unprecedented policy making. Government needs to set the course and be honest with the public about the situation. We are facing an enormous challenge - greater than any generation in history. Perhaps it is prudent for the act to include penalties for politicians and leaders who do not act. Scientists attest to dire consequences if politicians do not take drastic steps. This means MAJOR changes as a society in the next decade.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.