

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Raymond John Henderson

Reference no: 1775

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

There still seems to be a laissez faire attitude to temperature rise. The most recent data indicates that if we extrapolate beyond current trends we should reach 2C before 2060 (i.e., c. 40 years). Many scientists agree that 2C may be a tipping point beyond which global warming is irreversible. Assuming we cruise to 2050 with little or no change to existing trends in global warming then redefining targets may be a case of too little too late.

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

Irrespective of what happens internationally this is "our nuclear-free" moment. Was NZ ever partially opposed to nuclear weapons and nuclear energy??

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

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

A step-wise approach which breaks a major undertaking into bite-size chunks seems logical

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

This legislation does not want to see different parties lobbying to compromise outputs. We can't afford to yo-yo around with the climate change portfolio as we see with social and economic legislation.

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

No

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**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

To date we have had a laissez faire attitude to global warming. We need something like a 'business plan' with short-term and long-term objectives.

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 major contributors to New Zealand GHG emissions are: 1. Immigration and growth of the NZ population (each person is another carbon footprint); 2. Globalization with endemic Asian/African overpopulation, increasing Asian emission of greenhouse gases, Asian deforestation and Asian recolonization of many countries on Earth. 3. Agricultural emissions so: a) impose an environment tax on nitrogen-based fertilizers; b) impose a carbon tax on GHG emissions from livestock; 4. Fossil fuels for transport and industrial purposes (deregister petrol and diesel vehicles by 2050); To make change and reduce greenhouse gases options are to: 5. STOP IMMIGRATION; 6. Sequester more carbon with reforestation of marginal lands; 7. Update carbon credit system to forest owners; 8. Increase renewable sources of energy (e.g., new high dams on the Clutha?); 9. Ensure most forms of energy are electric by 2050; 10. Place price controls on electricity (if NZ is to remain competitive our electricity can't be twice the price of everyone else; it was 11c/unit in 1975 but now 28c per unit); 11. Provide seeding finance to establish synthetic milk and synthetic meat factories; 12. Transition from pastoral farming to horticulture; and, 13. Impose road haulage restrictions on the distances that goods can be shifted with trucks powered by fossil fuels.

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

See notes below

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

The caveat to my 'Yes' is that since 1984 we have had increasing levels of executive decisions by a quorum of people with ideologies about social and environmental change; and REDUCED DEMOCRACY. New Zealand has made calamitous decisions as a consequence. Democracy is 'government by the people' and this process must be respected. My fear with the commission is we will get increased executive powers that drive us towards unsustainable goals. In New Zealand I look at things like immigration, infrastructure deficits, increased consumption taxes and social impoverishment, none of which is sustainable, but they are the outcomes of executive decisions made despite public opposition to concepts like globalisation, neo-liberalism, consumption taxes, immigration etc. made by ideologists. There needs to be constraints on executive powers.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

It is inevitable; however, we can only adapt so much. With overpopulation, global warming, and loss of biodiversity (species extinctions) the concept of putting fingers in the dyke can only plug so many holes. Mitigation is better than adapting.

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

The caveat to my answer yes is that in essence many new functions are essentially 'the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff' rather than measures to mitigate risk (i.e., a barrier at the top of the cliff to prevent free-fall into global warming).

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

We signed the Paris agreement yet emissions have increased by 24.1% since 1990; the major reason for this increase is people focussed on economic outputs rather than environmental consequences. If it becomes mandatory to THINK about greenhouse gas emissions this will make people more cognissant of the consequences of emissions

Clause

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

Notes

If we look at the 'Paris Agreement' and targets of 11% below 1990 levels and look at population growth the logistics of reducing greenhouse gases become exceedingly difficult. In 1990 New Zealand had a population of 3.414 million, today our population at 4.76 million is 39% higher. We had to be 11% below 1990 levels so effectively at this moment in time every person that was alive in 1990 should have a carbon footprint 50% smaller than they did back then. But our Paris target was for 2030 (estimated population 5.2 million or a 9.5% increase); so by then every person that was alive in 1990 must have a carbon footprint 60% smaller than it was back then. If we continue this extrapolation to 2050 then the carbon footprint of someone alive in 1990 needs to be 78% smaller than it was back then. This is totally unrealistic; the only logical way to stem greenhouse gas emissions is to STOP population growth and more importantly STOP IMMIGRATION. Global warming is an international problem caused by globalisation; one where the major emitters are the Asian block of countries (China, India, Japan, Korea, Indonesia, Phillipines, etc) whom emitt >50% of all greenhouse gases. International pressure either through diplomacy (foreign affairs) or trade (an embargo on goods with high carbon footprints) must be imposed to arrest the growth in greenhouse gases from China and India especially. We MUST REDUCE ELECTRICITY PRICES if New Zealand is going to remain competitive. The free-market model for electricity implemented by the last 2 National governments has resulted in New Zealand having some of the most expensive electricity prices in the world. In India electricity is 5-6.5c per unit, in China 8c per unit, in Canada 10c per unit, in the USA 12c per unit, in the UK 20c per unit; but here in NZ it is 28c per unit. When we are reliant on electricity for energy and transport we cannot afford to pay the current price. Quite simple we will not be competitive in international markets. We must transition away from current agricultural commodities to horticulture. This should start now with seeding finance for synthetic milk and synthetic meat production. Agriculture must pay for high livestock emissions which will enhance the rate of change. A tax on nitrogen-based fertilizers must be imposed to reduce nitrates in surface and groundwater; and reduce emissions of nitrous oxide. One of the principle risks is we are locked into Keynesian economics which is a paradigm requiring compounded growth in all economic indicators to provide a workable framework for our economy. How can we have an economy with compounded growth year on year, when in fact we require compounded recessions year on year in our carbon footprint? How can compounded human impacts on ecosystems continue year on year when we want compounded growth of biodiversity to sequester carbon? How can compounded population growth continue year on year when the overshoot in world population currently exceeds 2 billion people and overshoot in the New Zealand population is almost 1 million people? What is the model for sustainability, because it certainly isn't what we have got at the minute.

Supporting documents from your Submission

sustainability.pdf

Uploaded on 06/27/2018 at 11:24AM