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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?  No

1b. What is most important to you?

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?

   This question is back to front. It should read how will the level that we set effect the economy.
   It is important that we develop an economy around very low emission levels. The current economy has to drastically change. It will be painful for some and present exciting new opportunities for others.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

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

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?

   Whatever it takes.
   A carbon tariff on goods and services imported from countries that do not take effective action set at the same rate as we will apply to local industry would assist households and local low carbon industries to be competitive. The important question is how this is paid for. The role of Government is how to make this fair.
   An incremental carbon tax that is free for the first few units, low for basic usage and exceedingly high for luxury consumption.
   Because of the huge disparity between rich and poor in this country what is fair should be based on the minimum wage.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?

   Do not take them into account.
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We have had plenty of opportunities to develop technologies however we have listened to the deniers, done nothing and are in a spot of bother, the markets never responded to future needs which you would not expect them to.
What is unacceptable is being rail roaded into using genetically engineered organisms
We will have to adapt to whatever technologies happen to be available at the time.
When the ship has sunk you hang on to anything that floats.
Don't worry the free market will self correct climate change.

Life boats are a regulatory requirement and are prepared well in advance of leaving port, if we sail over the horizon without even a life jacket

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. My full submission does not fit on this and will be sent in separately
The forward of the climate change consultation document 'New Zealand's Climate Change Target' is testament to the derisory effort the current Government has made to date. If you have any doubts watch the last five minutes of http://www.hotairfilm.co.nz/.

The forward places too much attention on the costs to businesses. Reality operates independently of business models and climate change is a grim reality.

In recent decades narrow sections of affluence have had undue influence on Government policy pushing Government into adopting reckless abandonment of civic responsibility to be replaced by untested market models.

I hope this will be an opportunity for Government to behave in a socially responsible way and drop the pretence that markets will self regulate. Climate change is the epitome of the need for Government intervention particularly when business interests engage in elaborate and intensive propaganda campaigns eg http://nzclimatescience.net/ to stymie Government's social obligation to respond to a looming crisis.

Another market response to avoid is where a crisis is used to create market opportunities where the opportunity to profit from suffering mas charades as concern for well being.
I want New Zealand to call for a global zero carbon target, and walk the talk by committing to a pathway towards zero fossil fuel CO2 emissions by 2050 or earlier (alongside reductions in other greenhouse gases).

I want an immediate moratorium placed on fossil fuel exploration, and pledge to phase out existing extraction within the decade. Further, that all subsidies, funding and tax breaks to the fossil fuel industry also be phased out within the decade.

I want a New Zealand climate law that holds the government accountable for reducing emissions, and an independent Climate Commission.

I want the Government to establish a cross-party climate working group and an ongoing programme to engage meaningfully with New Zealanders on climate change solutions.

I want to see meaningful policy changes that will start cutting New Zealand’s emissions, during this term of government.

I want to see health, fairness, and the true costs of inaction on climate change included in the assessment of costs and benefits.
I want to see the articles laid out in Te Tiriti o Waitangi as signed in good faith abided with.
I want to see a carbon tariff placed on goods and services from countries with less than adequate carbon reduction programs.
I want to see a full follow up and genuinely transparent decision-making process after the public consultation process ends.
I want Government to promote low carbon urban and peri urban development in the fashion of 'smart growth'.
I want Government to fully investigate public policy consultants and consultancy firms for conflicts of interest and advising on policy designed to promote business interests of themselves or their clients.
I want Government to exclude from any planning process or formal or informal discussion, Demographia and/or Wendall Cox or any staff or senior fellows, fellows, Directors or any persons receiving payment from or any person or organisation purveying policy, education programs, opinion editorials, press releases or business models or disinformation that hamper or obstruct urban or peri urban planning or
transport planning designed to avoid or mitigate the effects of climate change.
I want Government to disregard offsetting, carbon trading, or market mechanisms as methods to achieve carbon neutrality.

I want government to cease collaborating with and retract any agreements with organisations or agents that are climate change deniers or sceptics

I want organisations and representative groups that are or have been climate change deniers or sceptics to receive no public funding and in the event of being adversely effected by climate change to be the last to receive Government assistance.

I want Government run a media campaign to publicly expose industry led climate change deniers and sceptics and publicly admonish them for the harm their delaying tactics have caused.

I want Government staff and officials to show leadership in becoming carbon neutral.

Response to Q1. a)
Do you agree with the above objectives for our contribution?
'while also progressing beyond our previous commitments.'

The previous commitments were pathetic so going beyond pathetic is not much of a concession.

It is important to step back from pushing the line that we are a feeding the worlds hungry when we are complacent about malnourished children in our own country. The other countries understand that we are as likely as they to plough good food back into the ground if the prices are not high enough while children here go hungry.

The food business is like any other business, profit maximisation.
Sections of the farming community have obstructed attempts to co operate with them in relation to addressing reductions in GHGs from farm operations and animals, fart tax campaign.

The idea of using harvest-able forests as carbon sinks to offset fossil fuels is not credible.

The carbon cycle for forests is independent of the fossilised carbon. Forests can act as a temporary and partial sink but could never absorb the additional carbon from fossil fuels, if they did the oceans would not be acidifying.

To reduce farming emissions we could reduce stocking rates which would simultaneously allow for improvements in water quality.

High population growth could be checked by lowering immigration numbers and that would take pressure off housing shortages, traffic congestion and the need for expensive motorways.

The percentage of the carbon budget taken up by transport is under estimated in the bar chart of the discussion document. Encouraging the use of private motor cars by rolling out motorways encourages wasteful use of fossil fuels and CO2 emissions.

Any efficiency gains made by reducing fossil fuel consumption is a direct threat to the profitability of oil and gas industry.

So we are back to public benefit vs private profit.

Market methods and voluntary agreements to manage environmental issues have been shown to fail what they ostensibly set out to achieve, and are used as staling devices.

Good urban planning based on what has been termed smart growth needs to be re established around public transport cycleways and walkways connecting the places people need to go for their immediate needs.
Economic interests that benefited from (urban) sprawl were at risk as well. They had money and knew how to use it in politics. The highway lobby, always dependent on government contracts, was adept at keeping those contracts coming. The developers of tract subdivisions lived by their ability to influence local governments and their land-use rules.

These two forces – homeowners and politically connected businesses – could be stronger joined together than either could be on their own. Neither grass roots protest alone or back room influence peddling could turn back the smart growth tide; lobbying needed electoral backing. Protecting the status quo sprawl required an alliance, and the alliance would need a political program to mobilise the home owner masses.

Experienced partisans were at the ready, prepared to fill this demand. Beginning in the 1970’s, foundations and research institutes funded by the Mellons, the Kochs and other wealthy conservatives had nurtured a cadre of far right wing public policy experts. For these ideologues for hire, smart growth was a business opportunity. The real estate industry had already turned to them for arguments against growth control. They now jumped at the chance to target public transit too.

A separate group of anti transit consultants was already in the field— they had entered the market niche opened up over referendum battles over light rail. Once the Smart Growth movement took off in the late nineties, the right wing network invited the rail critics in. Sam Staley became deputy director of the Reason Foundation; Wendall Cox received part time appointment with the Heartland Institute, a centre of global warming denial, and the Heritage Foundation; Randle O'Toole wound up on the staff of the Cato Institute.

Conclusion

When our delegates go to the meeting in December in Paris I suggest that they be honest, hand out to all of the delegates copies of http://www.hotairfilm.co.nz/ and tell the world that our Government is gutless, will uphold US corporate interests and foreign policy and , pand to foreign investors and rogue elements of our local business community and continue to make appropriate sounding noises and continue to do nothing substantial. This will attract a lot more foreign investment as a result which is our current primary concern. I expect nothing positive from this process except playing along with window dressing presented by this Government which holds the public in absolute contempt.

Thank you for the opportunity,