

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Jennifer Dymock

Reference no: 2540

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

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

Notes

This proposed Bill presupposes that there is climate change that significantly impacts on New Zealand environmentally and socially and which necessitates mitigation responses. This has yet to be proven scientifically

Clause

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

Notes

No Zero Emissions targets are necessary as significant impacts of climate change yet to be determined scientifically.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Notes

There should be no targets as emissions are not yet scientifically assessed. Premature adherence to targets will negatively impact on New Zealand productivity and standard of living. No replacement "green" technologies are available or research into zero carbon alternatives planned.

Clause

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

Notes

I oppose the Bill. However the scientific method allows for challenges to hypotheses. Cannot prove an hypothesis, in this case, that significant climate change is occurring, but evidence that disproves the hypothesis is considered and the hypothesis is then rejected or modified. Scientific endeavour always allows for challenges, flexibility and modification of hypotheses in the face of evidence

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)?

Notes

There should be no Zero Carbon Bill and no emission budgets set

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

Notes

Reject the Bill as insufficient scientific evidence is available

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

Notes

Reject the Bill

Clause

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

Notes

Scrap emissions budgets

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

Consider all scientific evidence NOT just that which conforms to pre-existing viewpoints

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

Notes

Scrap the Climate Commission

Clause

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

Notes

Scrap the Climate Change Commission and the Emissions Trading Scheme

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

The Commissioners have been selected to agree with political sentiment (not analyse scientific data)

Clause

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

Notes

The zero carbon Bill, in its very nature, is attempting to mitigate (not adapt to) climate change which has been occurring since the earth was formed. Living beings on this earth have been subject to climate change for billions of years. Climate change is the norm. The zero carbon Bill should thus be scrapped.

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

Notes

Any change in future land use, production should be undertaken under guidelines which mitigate pollution including human and animal waste, toxic waste (chemicals, plastics). Carbon dioxide and methane are not pollutants. They are part of the carbon cycle = they are vital for life and cycle ie. are in balance.

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

More bureaucracy and waste of tax payers money

Clause

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

Notes

As entomologist working independently in the Far North of New Zealand I have been monitoring insects in the warmest part of New Zealand since 1999. Insects are regulated by temperature so are ideal indicators of climate change. I can report that since its arrival in 1999 the Tropical grass webworm, *Herpetogramma licasialis*, has not spread further south of Kaitaia, despite its food source kikuyu grass extending throughout Northland as far south as coastal Horowhenua. As its name suggests this is a tropical insect which is at the limit of its distribution in New Zealand north of Kaitaia. In 20 years climate has not warmed sufficiently for this insect to extend its range (Dymock et al. 2009. Proceedings of the New Zealand Grasslands Association 71: 25-30). I am currently working on distribution changes of a range of key insect indicators of climate change.