

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Murray Hawkes, **Alford Endeavours Ltd**

Reference no: 12161

Submitter Type: Individual

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?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting) and using some emissions reductions from overseas (international carbon units) that have strong environmental safeguards

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

No

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

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

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

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

Economic sustainability and competitiveness

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

Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

Notes**Clause**

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

Position

No

Notes

Legislating responses is doomed to failure, and to creating unplanned distortions (rorts) of the system

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

The current "Science" is not sufficiently mature to put actions into legislation

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

The linkage between global warming and non fossil fuel emissions is based on weak pseudo science. Natural systems all emit methane, there is no baseline available to compare say mature forest with agricultural methane emissions (insects digesting cellulose use the same class of methane generating endothermic bacteria as do ruminants) The biggest sources of non fossil fuel methane is mature forests and in the current warming cycle release of soil bound methane as a result of changed soil conditions. The bill aims to treat many unknowns as known, and to create an economically destructive artificial structure which will further distort our Quasimodo like economy to the long term detriment of the nation's people. Any carbon trading element should only be included for the humour factor, and if you have shares in big financial institutions, there will be zero environmental benefit, just a huge parasitic industry (consider how stumpage carbon is treated in current carbon credits (assumed to be perpetual, silly joke) Fossil fuel emissions almost directly track population growth, the linkage being the economic and welfare benefits of energy use, Fossil fuels provide the vast majority of this life giving (and life threatening) energy. Addressing emissions without addressing the underlying economy, and population driven expansion is futile and foolish. Identify the linkages in the legislation. We need to move away from population growth driven GDP to a per capita GDP, or wellbeing reference and use this as a basis for targets. Setting targets based on a single set of parameters is foolish.