

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

John Church, **John Church**

Reference no: 1703

Submitter Type: Individual

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

This should have been done 15 years ago when it became clear that global warming was accelerating.

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

This should have been done 15 years ago when it became clear that global warming was accelerating. And the goal should be 2030, not 2050. Ask your children what the goal should be.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

No trading should be permitted under any circumstance. Trading just gets used to postpone essential emission reductions.

Clause

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

Notes

The question is ambiguous and therefore unanswerable. Circumstances are already changing and at an accelerating rate.

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)?

Notes

The question is ambiguous and therefore unanswerable. Reviews which bring budgets forward in time are acceptable. Reviews which result in a postponement of targets (and the action required) simply increase the chances of economic (and social) collapse.

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

Our circumstances are already exceptional and will become increasingly so.

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

No

Notes

The main risk factors are economic and social collapse as a result of increasingly severe storms, floods, fires, sea level rise etc. None of these things are mentioned on page 44.

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

Of course. And sector by sector penalties for not meeting them.

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

The most important issue is the need to transition from an economic system which depends on unsustainable growth to an economic system which can provide for everyone's needs without unsustainable growth.

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

Yes of course. But the most important one is adaptation and this is nowhere spelled out. For example, there will be huge costs involved in rebuilding after fires and storms, moving people and housing from low lying areas to less flood prone areas, in coping with reduced agricultural productivity, in meeting the needs of increasing numbers of unemployed and so on.

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

Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available in the NZ ETS

Notes

An emissions trading scheme is ridiculous. It just postpones the inevitable. We need to get our emissions down to zero, and we need to make an immediate start on the adaptations which will be required now we know that global heating is going to continue for many generations.

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

All members must have expertise in (a) understanding ongoing research into the rate at which global heating is occurring, (b) identifying the adaptations which will be required in order to reduce the economic and social impacts of the global heating which is already built in, and (c) the town planning and infrastructure planning which will be required for this.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Of course. Much global heating is now built in and will continue even after every country in the world reduces its emissions to zero. So massive adaptations are now going to be required in order to reduce the death rate to acceptable levels and to avoid economic collapse.

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 to all of the items listed. Note that many things are missing such as adapting to the increased risk of disease, adapting to greatly reduced agricultural productivity, adapting to large scale population movements, adapting to unaffordable insurance premiums, adapting to a zero growth economy, etc, etc.

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

Yes ,of course. And there will need to be a a Government Department charged with identifying and coordinating adaptation planning and implementation.

Clause

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

Notes

It is good to see New Zealand making a start on future proofing the New Zealand economy and the welfare of future generations. However, we are starting on this journey very late and it is going to be a much more painful and expensive journey than it would have been had we started 15 years ago when the the accelerating rate of global heating had been clearly identified by our scientists.