

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Deanne Helen Smeaton

Reference no: 1485

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

None. It shouldn't be the Government to tackle this issue, whenever the government tries to change human behaviour it always backfires. It should be left to innovative technology which overtime will reduce emissions. Also more study should be done to see if human made emission are causing a adverse effects. The planet is over 300 million years old and we only have scientific data from the last few hundred years, with only a third being accurate.

Clause

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

Notes

See previous comment

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

There shouldn't be targets and carbon credit is just another money revenue, it does not help tackle the issues.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Of course!

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

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

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

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

As long as all scientific research is taken into account, not just the ones that confirm bias'

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

Government is not the best to tackle this issue.

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

As said above, I don't think government is the best to tackle this issue. But if this goes ahead, scientists from both sides should be consulted, farmers, businesses and other world leaders.

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 long as they aren't bias and don't keep moving the goal post.

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

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

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

Position

No

Notes**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**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**Clause**

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

Notes

It shouldn't be the Government to tackle this issue, whenever the government tries to change human behaviour it always backfires. It should be left to innovative businesses and technology which overtime will reduce emissions. Also more study should be done to see if human made emission are causing a adverse effects. The planet is over 300 million years old and we only have scientific data

from the last few hundred years, with only a third being accurate.