

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

John David Boyes

Reference no: 12627

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

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 zero emissions by 2040

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

No

Notes

Should be yearly for zero by 2040

Clause

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

Notes

Stupid question

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

Another stupid question

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

IPCC

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

It can be ignored in the usual manner

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

Should advise the government to have no part of it,

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

Too much economist and business input.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Fir heavens sake

Clause

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

Notes

Annual mandatory targets should be established for carbon emissions, with measures for correcting and penalising missed targets. The emissions target should be zero by 2040 and continuing to zero or less by 2050. In comparison with other economies which seem to be being used as benchmarks New Zealand has a relatively easy task. Thus there is no need to put things off to 2050, regardless whether 2050 is or is not a very plausible target for other countries. Without a mandatory annual plan a long term target such as 2040 has little meaning, even if such a target is one of the points on the implied curve. Without a mandatory annual plan sectors which may have to be reduced or eliminated will experience no pressure to take any action. This is true enough for any activity, but we are unfortunate in having a small number of large rather inflexibly established players. For such there is a clear advantage in looting their sectors in advance of a long term problem which will not go away, while influencing governments to direct attention elsewhere. A carbon budgeting system should be established with no convertibility between money and carbon, in effect a parallel currency. If trading between carbon and money is allowed it is naive to think that the intelligent and unscrupulous people in the financial sector will not run rings around conflicted and malleable politicians. It is unfortunate that our national culture has become totally fiscalised, so that it is difficult to imagine any other mechanism that the public would understand. In some rather pedantic sense, trading could take place, but only in the same sense that at present some people may think it worthwhile to, for example, commit crimes. So missed targets might for example involve monetary fines of more than profits made. The basic supply for a carbon currency would in effect be related to the emission targets. This raises some interesting possibilities. An example is currency disappearing if not used, which is a quite conventional idea. Another would be use of the currency to improve people's standard of living - for example as a reward to allow a non-consuming improved lifestyle such as fewer working hours. It is almost an insult to the victims of economic policies of the recent past to discuss concerns about household incomes. New Zealand has grotesque income inequality, which if left unaddressed make any changes involving emissions changes a minor factor in the general misery. On the positive side, the available task of rebuilding a balanced economy can be used to create employment and to restore standards of living. As regards our international role it is often supposed, in effect, that New Zealand is so small it can hope to operate unnoticed, or that our image is so good that we can get away with anything. However, any discussion of carbon emissions which does not acknowledge that the problem is linked to the disaster of global overpopulation is irresponsible. Purely in terms of self interest, even if New Zealand transitioned to zero or even negative emissions we still have much the same serious problem. Certainly, we could feel virtuous and have fewer cars, less pointless work, better food and housing and so on as a consequence of a zero carbon economy, but extreme climatic events will still be a rolling disaster. Just how overpopulation can be addressed may not be immediately obvious but it has to be considered. There is even the possibility of providing a model for other countries, though that might be laughable at present. Targets for population decrease in New Zealand, involving if necessary resources to address the necessary demographic

changes, could be set. Equally, New Zealand could do much more to counteract pressures to increase population worldwide. This may seem to be none of our business, but other governments have no scruples about increasing carbon emissions by encouraging growth and consumption outside their own countries.