

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Neville Baxter, (Science and Engineering NZ Ltd) (Neville Baxter)

## Reference no: 9120

**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

Zero net greenhouse emissions by 2050 or sooner. (Is it really necessary to have a 4 litre off-road vehicle just to commute to the office and supermarket on fully-sealed urban roads at 100 km/h or less? Egotism is a very big stumbling block.)

### 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

Methane in the atmosphere will eventually break down to carbon dioxide, which has less greenhouse effect than methane.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Let's keep it very simple and get our own house in order: decrease NZ emissions and not be messed about again by fiddlers manipulating international credits. Remove the subsidies and tax breaks (obsolete since the 1950's) from the oil industry so that renewable energy sources can compete on a more even footing.

### Clause

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

### Position

No

### Notes

Only to reduce it to an earlier date than 2050. The "rednecks" will always try to stall and backpedal as much as possible, if they believe there is advantage for themselves and their friends in it. (Sometimes it is merely ignorance and inertia, or the fear of rapid change. Therefore changes should be signaled well in advance and introduced gradually and progressively, with plenty of publicity and education. More-gradual societal change could possibly have prevented the 1979 Iranian revolution.)

### 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

Specific 5 year plans are a good idea. Japan's recovery after 1945 used 5-year plans, covering Optics, Ship building, Electronics, Cars and other areas. With large local and foreign markets for these products, these were very successful. New Zealand's "products" would include continued tourism and continued production of wood and other primary produce.

### Clause

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

### Notes

The basic plan must be followed over the long term. If some parts can be made to readily proceed faster than the schedule, then there can be some flexibility later. But if the plan falters (such as due to huge sales of giant cars and yachts on easy credit), then it will have trouble making up lost ground afterwards. (Beware of the rednecks.)

**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**

Only upon the outbreak of World War 3, or equivalent.

**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**

By definition, that is what a government is for: to govern. It is Government's job to impartially set the rules in a fair, logical and realistic manner and make sure that all participants play to the rules. Those who compete most effectively and efficiently inside those rules will prosper more than the inefficient players. This prevents cheats from getting an unfair advantage over the honest people. (The opposite of unfettered free action.)

**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**

Find out what needs to be done to achieve the end result (reduction in fossil fuel consumption and therefore emissions), work out who will be involved in this (farming, industry, transport, owners of buildings and businesses etc) and evaluate the options that are available (more efficient buildings, vehicles, move towards large turboprop airliners, minimization of waste in all forms, where possible and practical).

**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**

Monitoring and reporting must always be done by fully independent bodies. Businesses and individuals inherently cannot be trusted to self-regulate if cheating might result in greater personal or company benefit at the overall cost to the environment. There should be timely progress reports (feedback) to make sure that targets are progressing on schedule relative to the main plan. And a big stick.

**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**

Beware of fiddling of the system by vested interests. The ETS is inherently a rather dubious idea, of limited merit.

**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**

Real experts are worth their weight in gold. Bad "experts" are worth less than radioactive, polluted mud.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

No

**Notes**

Adaptation is, of course, a related issue and there needs to be considerable interaction. But the two issues should be addressed separately. Zero Carbon should concentrate first and foremost on reducing emissions, while having conversations "on the side" regarding adaptation to climate change. Climate change is happening anyway and we have to adapt as best we can (such as building most new houses higher above the ground to lessen risk of flooding), while trying to minimize it by decreasing use of fossil fuels as much as possible, as soon as possible (such as by fitting most houses and businesses with heat exchangers to preheat fresh air from the outgoing stale air).

**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**

There should be good interchange of information to allow and encourage any worthwhile improvements and avoid or minimize expensive pitfalls. (There is no point in having a gold-plated wharf or house that is buried under the sea.)

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

On a slightly related matter, in early July 2018, I submitted a proposal to the Hutt City Council for an improved method of rubbish disposal. This could hugely reduce the amount of waste plastic and paper in the environment, while easing the load on landfills, improving the quality of material sent to recycling and providing useful "boiler fuel". This would involve no major changes to the existing arrangements, but would add a new option. The new option ("Project Orange") would nominally involve using pre-paid, orange-coloured plastic bags for combustible, non-halogenated solid waste materials. Households and businesses would voluntarily put all odds and sods of waste plastic (non-halogenated), paper, cardboard, small wood scraps etc into this bag, which would be collected by the council in the normal collection. But instead of going to landfill or recycling, it would be used for thermal power generation, industrial steam generation, heating of large buildings or simply burned off to dispose of it. By being burned usefully, this could hugely decrease the escape of plastics into the sea, heavily reduce the load on landfills, and allow a small reduction in consumption of coal, natural gas and/or biomass. (The last part would be good for decreasing carbon dioxide emissions by decreasing the mining and use of fossil fuels).