

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

## Reference no: 11630

**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

### 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

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Notes

Trees are definitely not the answer. Pasture produces photosynthesis which turns CO2 into O2. There is more pasture and it grows more quickly than trees. Trees ruin soil and take 30years to grow. There will be more unemployed people living in NZ, fewer jobs, higher taxes and NZ will have to import more food instead of sustaining ourselves and exporting more. We will be at the mercy of our competitors.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

Concrete evidence that this is actually happening. Use other plants that help NZs economy become stronger throughout, not just long term but now. Trees don't do this. Government, stop screwing over your own people. Agriculture brings in the money by exporting goods and services, provides work for most NZers directly and indirectly. Why are you trying to hinder/stop NZ Agricultural people from producing money for their country with the awesome skills that they have?

### 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

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

### Notes

Under the Commissioners direction.

### 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

Only if you have Commissioners who are realistic and tell the Government what to put into the second emissions budget (i.e. abolish it). Can we really trust the Commissioners, as the Government will be the people choosing who the Commissioners will be. Unfair!!

**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**

No

**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**

Trees are definitely not the answer. Pasture produces photosynthesis which turns CO2 into O2. There is more pasture and it grows more quickly than trees. Trees ruin soil and take 30years to grow. There will be more unemployed people living in NZ, fewer jobs, higher taxes and NZ will have to import more food instead of sustaining ourselves and exporting more. We will be at the mercy of our competitors.

**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**

No

**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**

Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available 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**

No

**Notes**

If you need Commissioners, they must actually have expertise in this area. Not made up to suit people in the Government putting bums on seats and paying them a ridiculous wage for doing nothing. Is this the best use of New Zealanders money? Where else are you going to get the money from?

**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**

No

**Notes****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****Clause**

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

**Notes**

Allowing Governments to attack Agricultural sectors will seriously affect everybody in NZ in a very negative way (i.e. most people will be unemployed, there won't be new jobs to go into, higher taxes, less income, everything will be more expensive to buy as NZ will need to buy food in, instead of being a quality exporter that brings in money for our country), especially for something that is purely based on assumptions. Are we really going to plant trees over 10% of quality, versatile farmland that produces renewable pasture at least 4 times per year and through photosynthesis turns carbon dioxide into oxygen a lot quicker and more often than trees. Trees takes 30 years to grow, don't need a lot of care, strips the nutrients from the soil and it would take a good 5 years to rejuvenate the soil after the trees have been felled and stumps have been removed etc. The billion dollars worth seems to be only for planting trees and paying bums on seats with fancy job titles, not what is needed to help our country to produce enough food for our people (all NZers) and be exported to other countries, which brings in money for our country to help us live better lives. Our Government is wasting our time, money and messing with our livelihoods at our expense. Fellow NZers do you really think that our Government members are going to put their hands in their own pockets to put a large percentage of their paycheques into these assumptions? Why should we?

**You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.**