

# Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Paul Elwell-Sutton

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

1.) That the collective behaviour and culture of New Zealanders and visitors changes to reflect that the profligate consumption of energy is no longer acceptable, and that there is no technological fix for this. We have to transition to a low carbon and low energy consuming civilisation.

We need to be leaders, not followers, and take courage from our historical ability to become Nuclear-Free and give women the vote.

2.) Primary industry, including agriculture, forestry, mining and fisheries must be included in carbon emissions calculations and reductions, and the move to a low carbon emissions society.

3.) Tourism, exports and imports must be included in carbon emissions calculations, i.e. emissions from sea and air transport of people and goods to be included in emissions calculations and reduction.

4.) That NZ become carbon neutral by 2025.

What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

2. What do you think the nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means for the level of target that we set?

Short-term costs of becoming carbon-neutral will be outweighed by long-term savings from avoiding exacerbated climate change. We must aim for carbon neutrality by 2025.

Financial relief should be available to households to cover the short-term costs in the form of tax/rates rebates and the like.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

As above. Aim for carbon neutrality by 2025. Only fear causes focus on short-term costs.

Long term savings need to be the focus of policies to reduce carbon emissions.

Also, important must be the adoption of Keynesian domestic economic policies to enable and facilitate government spending on socially and environmentally policies, and for the creation of credit and money to revert to the NZ Reserve Bank in order to be independent of private (banks, financial institutions) sources of finance and credit.

These provisions will facilitate carbon emission reduction policies freer from pressure from the market-driven prerogatives from outside NZ, which benefit from the status quo, and resist meaningful carbon emission reduction policies.

# Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

---

4. Of the opportunities for New Zealand to reduce its emissions (as outlined on page 15 of the discussion document), which do you think are the most likely to occur, or be most important for New Zealand?

All important, but a change in social attitude behaviour is the final key.

As with smoking, a high energy consuming lifestyle should become socially unacceptable.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target? Ignore them and do the right thing. There is no future in delay tactics.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. Adopt 2025 as the year for carbon neutrality.

Supplementary Submission on NZ's Climate Change Contribution Consultation from Paul Elwell-Sutton (following on from my submission of 2/6/15).

Name: Paul Elwell-Sutton

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: No phone.

**1.) Response to Question 3.**

The figure of \$1,800 for a 40% reduction in carbon emissions is very modest. Financial assistance for socio-economically vulnerable persons must however be available.

It is unclear why electricity prices would increase (p.14 para1) given such a target, since NZ's electricity is largely generated from renewable sources.

**I submit** that the 40% target is modest and very affordable.

**2.) How will Our Target Affect Our Economy?**

The document fails to justify the figures quoted as costs to meet specified targets. No attempt made to cost the effects on the economy of exacerbated climate change resulting from weak responses to the need to cut carbon emissions.

**I submit** that the poor cost analysis needs to be remedied.

**3.) Response to Question 1.**

The document is unclear how NZ's emissions are calculated.

Essential to include all land use emissions (including agriculture), fisheries, tourism, emissions from sea and air transport of exports and imports (including tourism).

**I submit** that the above be included in emissions calculations. Once this has been done it is likely that NZ's emissions will be found to be significant given its size.

**4.) Box 10 (Food Security).**

The claim that 70% more food will need to be produced by 2050 is unsubstantiated. No acknowledgement is made of the political reasons for food shortages and the effects of catastrophic levels of inequable wealth distribution within and between nations. Nor is there any acknowledgement of the pressing need for a global compact on population management and control.

**I submit** that the figure given is spurious and merely an excuse to defer reduction of agricultural emissions.

Agricultural techniques already exist to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, petrochemicals and synthetic fertilisers, all of which reduce carbon emissions while enhancing soil fertility and carbon sequestration, ultimately resulting in increased productivity.

This is not difficult to do, but it does require a cultural change by the agricultural sector.

**5.) The Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).**

**I submit** that the ETS be scrapped.

**Reason.**

The ETS fails to modify profligate use of high carbon emissions behaviour and activities and is an excuse for business as usual.

What is needed is a brave approach to changing our culture to one where such behaviour and activities are as socially unacceptable as smoking or drink-driving. This will require educational campaigns with government support, a cheap price to pay for climate stability.

End of submission.