

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Bruce Justin (BJ) Chippindale

Reference no: 2596

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 target is not particularly important, as the process will be "overtaken by events" long before we get there.

Clause

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

Position

Net Zero Long-Lived Gases and Stabilised Short-Lived Gases - Long-lived gases to net zero by 2050 while also stabilising short-lived gases

Notes

The short lived (CH4) remains a part of the normal cycle.

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

Yes

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

This is a reasonable way of managing change

Clause

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

Position

Yes - the third emissions budget should be able to be changed but only when the subsequent budget is set

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

Never say never.

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

I cannot guess for certain, the reference is NOT there, but I doubt that the bill considers the indirect but most puissant threat to New Zealand. The global enforcement of CO2 pricing which WILL happen, will cut OUR trade. We are on our own.

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

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 THREAT to New Zealand is not directly from the destabilized climate. The most important (and ENTIRELY unavoidable) threat is from the actions taken globally to bring emissions under control. When a CO2 price becomes commonly enforced, and that WILL HAPPEN, our trade will be cut in half. We are not prepared for that.

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

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

I note the absence of an actual reference. The document summary does not have so many pages :-). There are a half dozen other (likely former sections of a larger doc) documents, I cannot guess. The desirable expertise needs to be there, just don't know what you chose.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Emphatically - because this, more than anything, is the chief threat

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

As before, I don't have the ability to find the reference.

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**Clause**

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

Notes

It won't hurt us all that much, will it? An Island in the middle of a big ocean? All the effects will be buffered by the ocean, won't they? Yup. Likely true for, though a lot of our infrastructure will end up underwater... in 100 years or so. Yet there is another inconvenient truth that New Zealand is blind to. A devastatingly "inconvenient truth" that will be more serious for NZ than most places and will arrive sooner. As the climate starts to unravel, and delivers regular shocks to the economic system, (very likely by 2030, certain by 2035) the cost of CO2 will be forced above \$100 per tonne. That's a generational change, a recognition of peril, and a shift that will affect the whole world. There is no "free trade". There is no "free". At that level the price of fuel for shipping triples, the cost of shipping doubles, and our trade IS LESS THAN HALF ITS PREVIOUS LEVELS!!! At their best the "free trade" agreements give us a 1 or 2% incremental increase. Cutting trade in half isn't thinkable here in NZ Yet it WILL HAPPEN! Whether we choose to prepare or not, climate destabilization will affect trade and it will affect OUR trade more than anyone else's because... ...we are further from everywhere than anyone else is. When we export wood and import wood furniture, we have damaged our economy and the environment. The benefit of the "cheaper" furniture does not offset the long term damage. When we export Apples and import Applesauce, we have damaged the economy and the environment just the same. When we allow industry to depend on foreign suppliers of critical components, foreign suppliers at risk of failing as climate worsens, we damage our national security. Ricardo never, in spite of the blunders in his treatise on "comparative advantage" pushed the notion that is common knowledge in New Zealand today, that we should ONLY make the things we are good at. We can't afford to continue to believe that. The most important and difficult change? We have to change our minds. This is the LEAST step we can take, and it needs to be taken now.