

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reuben Cohen,

Reference no: 4805

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 goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later

Notes

The target date should be 2030

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

Net is not good enough, it has to be zero for each greenhouse gas.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

New forest planting of long lived trees.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

We are talking zero now but will probably need negative carbon soon.

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

Providing they are stricter ie less emissions.

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

Only if it reduces further the permitted emissions.

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

Only if it further reduces the emissions.

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

Remove the economic considerations. We are talking about the survival of our species. First ensure that then think about economics. The cost is irrelevant when survival is at stake. If you put a cost to it then, by implication, when that economic cost is reached we stop trying and just die.

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

Much sooner rather than later.

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 this, approximately three trillion trees on this planet are not coping with the emissions we make so planting in the billions will not help. We have to cut down our emissions drastically and change the way we survive.

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

Unless the government is forced to take notice what good will a monitor be?

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

NZ ETS should be scrapped because we all need to make sacrifices and not just the rich who can buy their way out of changes.

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

No

Notes

Disagree with economic expertise being needed. We are trying to save our species and we don't need to set a price on that.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

It is the key to saving our species.

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

Impact on our health and culture is really secondary to our survival. We might have to put up with sub-optimal health in order to survive.

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

No exceptions for any business, commercial or government.

Clause

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

Notes

The Paris agreement is a shame on humans. It is unfortunately needed because we are unable to make ourselves do what is necessary without others being made to do the same. We have all created this situation and must all respond to trying to mitigate some of it. The government must react more urgently than it is doing at present regardless of what any previous government did to make things more difficult now. At present Regional Councils are granting consents which are negating any efforts to mitigate climate change. There should be a moratorium on all consents now. In the Edgecumbe Flood of 2017 I lost my family home of 30 years. The Council has taken over my property to repair the breached stopbank and reposition a roadway but is negating any works it does by granting consents which will produce more green house gas. Don't spend so much time on the bureaucracy that we make the situation worse and are then less able to do something about it.