

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Toby Heale

Reference no: 1063

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

Be very careful not to prejudice your options by making decisions that prejudice the future. The exact opposite of your intentions

Clause

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

Notes

You must prove each manifestation on a case by case basis. it is not good enough to select any of the options above. Question yourself as the future will question you and see how prejudiced those options are. You will lose all -and some of it is worthwhile - because you are not being specific.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

Do you think what New Zealand does will have the slightest effect on the planet? Really? And you are putting this into law! Please take care and think, You will make a fool of yourself and the green movement by these grand strokes of self-righteous crusading. The best thing -the very best thing you can do is to wait until the switch to electric cars is complete and revisit the situation. If you want to help now, promote that switch.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

See above. Technology will change practically every aspect of life in the coming twenty years, that is if we are not engulfed in war. War caused by people who cannot think outside the box, the status quo, who cannot shift the paradigm. Don't be amongst them and that is where you are today. Your approach is wrong in my view.

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

No

Notes

You cannot legislate against the tide. You cannot legislate for the tide. it will change at its own pace. Manage the changes you seek inside the natural progress of science.

Clause

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

Position

Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

Notes

Almost certainly this bill will be repealed by a subsequent government as it should be. Do you want that? Think more about what you seek to achieve. No, really seek to achieve, because unless you do, you will achieve nothing and possibly lose a lot. The Green movement must consider that it is betting its credibility on this bill.

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 you try to prevent that you guarantee the repeal of this act.

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

see above, Manage your expectations inside the technology changes. Promote changes that you see help your cause. Avoid sanctions. That just generates opposition.

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

You might as well face it. This bill will be repealed. As an exercise compare the Human Rights Treaty of Rome in the 1950s and the Declaration of Human Rights of 2000. Very soon the whole Human Rights industry will collapse because of the 2000 declaration. The two treaties are so far apart and on the same subject. which will survive the longest. think about that and cut your cloth accordingly. We live in a demand economy with a free society. Don't introduce a command economy with n enslaved society you will never be forgiven for that. I will debate this but not here. There isn't room here and this isn't the right forum, but my point is valid.

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

CARBON NEUTRAL ACT Combatting the effects of climate change and achieving a 'carbon neutral' economy to eliminate or modify climate change are two different objectives. The first policy, to combat the effects of climate change, is direct action to address the symptoms of climate change. The second policy, to achieve a carbon neutral economy, is designed to address the claimed cause of climate change. It is imperative that before the second policy is embarked upon there is the most robust examination of this diagnosis. If the diagnosis is wrong the plan will fail and costs and disruption will have been incurred for no good benefit while the perceived bad consequences of climate change would go unchecked. The robust examination of the diagnosis is to eliminate any false input and every aspect of assumption of a 'dead-letter.' By 'dead-letter' I mean the rump of an abandoned or discredited policy that has been allowed to linger and to retain lasting influence. I urge the proposers to re-examine every fact, opinion and assumption before initiating this policy which is possibly based on no more than a shibboleth, and for them to have open minds enough to invite qualified opinion that states that carbon dioxide is not the cause of global warming, but that it is caused by some other phenomenon. I believe it is then incumbent on the proposers of this law to attest that they have examined the latest available evidence and that they agree with the science that has been explained to them and that they are certain, beyond reasonable doubt (i.e. ninety per cent) that eliminating a carbon dioxide deficit will end global warming. Their credibility will hang on their decision, as indeed it should.

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

As an advisory body it can only cost money. It can do as little harm as it can do good. That many be sad, but like all advisory bodies it is true. It s up to the responsible minister to make the decisions. This Advisory body will become the modern equivalent of a lunch club. Be careful.

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

Carbon Trading schemes are an avenue for corruption, principally bribery followed by forgery. You must understand what lies behind these schemes and avoid it. The last thing you want is for New Zealand to be tarnished by association with corrupt input data. Without mentioning any country by name New Zealand could easily enter into an agreement that was entirely fictitious from the counter part's point of view. when that is exposed New Zealand is complicit.

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

Position

Yes

Notes

It is vital that all advisers are impartial (not activist) professional people of probity.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

See above. these are two entirely different objectives

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

No

Notes

Government is already straining budgets and it has raised expectations that it cannot fulfil. The world looks recessionary and if that is the case the costs of what you propose here will be unbearable on the economy. In this regard it is essential that the government appreciates and agrees with the proposition that government spending drains wealth, private spending generates wealth.

Government is already taking too much out of the private sector. (see tax reform).

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

No

Notes

No, this is compliance for compliance sake. This is a new worldwide development and it is necessary to consider it carefully. Compliance has grown into an industry with the power to fund itself through massive fines. International investment will consider the regulatory environment, not just market and taxation, before investing and I will refuse more often. We have come to a point where regulators seek to control every aspect of their 'subjects' lives, without having responsibility for the business, and certainly not its success. Regulators have become parasitical. You will appreciate that those businesses will be run into the ground, but before they go there they will load their fees onto their customers slowing down the whole economy. Be aware of this law of unintended consequences.

Clause

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

Notes

Carbon Zero may be inappropriate. If global warming is cyclical this bill is just a pollution control bill and it must not have teeth if it is to survive in any form.