

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Wendy Gray

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone

Email [REDACTED]

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

Firstly the objectives do not deal with the real issues in my opinion. I also think they are more political than suited for this enormous and important issue.

The most important objective should be educating every New Zealander about the role that plants, especially mature trees, have played in creating New Zealand's and the World's biosphere and the role they play in managing our biosphere on a day to day basis.

This is the most important factor in this consultation.

Without plants, (be they the phyto-plankton our World relies on to oxygenate the atmosphere, (which are fast being depleted from the seas because of our activities), or terrestrial mature plants, again fast being depleted (with encouragement from Government policy)) because of our uneducated activities), especially mature green leafy trees, the level of oxygen in the air we breath will continue to be depleted and the level of carbon in the air we breath will continue to rise as it continues to do on a daily basis.

Making changes in our fossil fuel consumption will alleviate matters but will not solve the underlying problem as we continue to destroy our oxygen producers.

Educating New Zealanders about the role of plants and mature trees in creating New Zealand's and the World's biosphere and environment and their role in creating us and maintaining us, (plants were here before we were and are highly intelligently designed to support and sustain us), is the best most cost effective action the Government can take to contribute to a change in behaviour and understanding of the people of New Zealand of the real issues we face on our planet.

We need a JOINED UP approach to this and JOINED UP means the Government looking at its OWN POLICIES which are encouraging "Climate Change" or, as I would rather put it, are contributing in large measure to the imbalance of the World's biosphere.

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?

Zero emissions should be our target and we need a plan to get there.

It seems that this Government does not even intend to have a plan for any emissions target we set. If we do not have a plan what is the point of setting a target?

Hopefully Simon Bridges the Minister responsible for Climate change will actually do what he is paid for and look at his portfolio on Climate Change and find out what climate change "targets" actually mean. Otherwise he is not fit for purpose and should be sacked. This is such an important issue that to treat it with such arrogance and distain is extreme arrogance, extreme negligence and behaviour justifying his sacking and dismissal from parliament.

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



Copy of your submission

---

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?

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?

Summary

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

1. In your video just released on 6 May you say that this consultation is one of the most important for New Zealand. You are correct.

It is THE most important consultation for every New Zealander to do in their lives.

Yet you give only one month, if that, for this consultation to take place?

I do hope that this does not mean that Mr Groser/ Simon Bridges is just doing this for show and has already written his submissions for the Climate Change conference. This would not only be an insult to the people of New Zealand but a huge betrayal of the future of all New Zealanders and most particularly our young people.

2. There are uncertainties with new technologies but they appear to be cheaper than fossil fuel solutions, they don't have the environmental destruction and imbalancing effects that continuing with fossil fuels has.

There are far more uncertainties with continuing with the current Victorian Technologies of fossil fuels which should have been put out to pasture years ago. For example, now that new technology is delivering an affordable Tesla Generator every New Zealander could decide to go off grid using just solar. I do wonder if this question is about compensation for the outdated fossil fuel and electricity industries? If this is what it is about it should say so.

3. I am confused that there appears to be no space for comment at questions 3 and 4?

The consultation document provided by the Government is very biased toward giving a negative view of the changes NZers will have to make. Also it is very focussed on individual cost of making changes.

The Consultation document does not address the opportunities that exist for us with the amazing and outstanding new technologies that are currently available to us, and continue to be being uncovered, to help us make those changes.

The consultation document is cynically deficient in not pointing out the costs and consequences IF WE DO NOTHING or if we provide an inadequate response to this most pressing issue for our children and their children. I also take issue with the costs which have been set out in the consultation document they seem to be politically motivated to obtain a certain result.

When you give the New Zealand people the information about how the biosphere works and how they and every other being on this planet depends on plants to be able to live on this planet you will not need targets. Targets are a political device to look like you are doing something when you are not, e.g. no follow through once the target is set with a plan of action.

4. In your video you champion the Agriculture sector which you say is world class and in the consultation document you indicate 48% of our carbon emissions come from the Agriculture sector. You intimate that we cannot do anything about this yet that is so wrong. Clearly it is Government's intention not to look at the Agriculture sector to improve its practices. NZ farming practices maybe world class but the majority of our industrial farmers are aiming for a low standard for their produce, given the amount of chemicals they use in their practices (some very dangerous chemicals like Roundup and Glyphosate which are being banned in other countries), the feed they give their animals (can be contaminated with GMOs) and their reliance on fossil fuels to manage their farms. Such farming management leading to increased unhealthy levels of nitrogen, potassium and cobalt in our soils, animals, waterways, and to consequences like increased events of erosion, flooding and drought conditions in dry summers. All because of poor farming practices which fail to farm for these events. Our practices fall well below the level of the best in the world but that is not to say that there are some farmers whose practices are it is just that they are

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



Copy of your submission

---

not the majority.

Looking the dairy industry which not only has emission issues but also water and soil pollution problems. Not to mention the low quality of industrial produced dairy product amply demonstrated by the price of milk powder \$2500 per tonne (industrially produced using chemicals) compared with organic \$10,000 per tonne. There is a clear business case to change government policy to support organic farming and practices as it would increase farmers profits, be better for NZ's environment and biodiversity and increase the government's tax take from farming. The consequence of following an organic farming policy would be to reduce emissions from animals (research has demonstrated that industrial farming feeding and animal management practices create more methane) and our reliance on fossil fuels in the form of fertiliser which is shown to be very destructive of soil bacteria which contributes directly to NZ's soil erosion problem.

There is much the sector could do by changing their farming practices to more natural practices, away from the industrial/chemical model, to sequester more carbon, use less water, plant more trees (it would certainly help our erosion problem and flooding problem in some areas), and have more humane animal practices which not only enhance the health of our animals but reduces the gases they produce.

I believe your video is misleading and more propoganda than reality. But then I have high standards.

5. One further issue about the Agriculture sector in New Zealand, you do not factor in the environmental cost of their activities when you look at the economic benefits. It is only in recent years that the environmentally destructive effects of the farming sector on our water-ways have become national news. Still the farming sector is not being levied to pay for the environmental effects of their farming on the New Zealand environment and the costs of repairing the damage they cause. It is time that it was.

The chemicals used in the farming sector also cause significant carbon costs to the biosphere. Using Roundup to kill bush or what are considered to be weeds, has a net oxygen loss to the immediate environment and the biosphere. It is not just mature trees that create oxygen they are just the most efficient producers. Not to mention the damage that it does to our water ways and eventually the sea contributing to the loss of phyto-plankton in the oceans ( which are supposed to produce 80% of our OXYGEN) and the imbalances in our waterways and on our land.

6. Forestry, is it a solution as you claim? Young trees are planted, often they are pinus radiata for sale to Asian countries. Young trees do not produce oxygen to balance the carbon we produce. It is only when trees mature that they produce more oxygen than carbon. One mature tree 18 inches in diameter can produce sufficient oxygen for 2 people in a year. Cut down that tree and how do you reproduce the oxygen?

So in tree farming when the trees are mature you cut them down, depleting the biosphere of the oxygen they are producing and the management of the biosphere they are contributing to. Using fossil fuel burning machinery and transport, you then put them on a ship, one of the most carbon wasteful forms of transport, and send them across the ocean. How is this a solution? Please explain I would really like to know the answer to this deceitful statement oft-repeated by the Forestry industry in this country?

The fact is the only way that tree farming is a solution is if you leave the trees where they are and DO NOT CUT THEM DOWN. But this is not what you are suggesting is it?

7. Mature, large and notable trees. NZers have a problem, they do not value their mature large trees. They cut them down. The most important trees for biosphere management are the mature and biggest trees no matter what they are. Each tree contributes to the management of the local biosphere and the whole biosphere of the whole planet. Just like the hairs on your head contribute to the whole head of hair. As a planet we are becoming pretty bald. As a nation we are in a net loss situation. Since 2008 annually NZ loses more trees than it plants. This is a national disaster. The problem is Government policy is directly responsible for this.

I request that you urgently audit your policies to address the contribution that your policies are making to the loss of the oxygen producers and also the contribution they are making to our carbon footprint.

We live in a world where everything we do contributes to the sum total of what goes on in the rest of the world. We

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



Copy of your submission

---

must grasp this concept. It is uneducated and arrogant to imagine that what we do has no effect on others, the rest of the world, our neighbours. We have to take this into our consideration if we are doing our best for our children and their children.

8. What was clear at the consultation meeting in Auckland is that the Department of Environment has a pretty negative attitude towards climate change targets and planning to reach those targets, because they don't have a plan to reach the targets!

What came out of that meeting was the amazing opportunities that this point in time is offering to us. I encourage those who do have an input into the report that we were told would be produced for Cabinet, that those opportunities that were time and again set out by the educated, knowledgeable and very eloquent people who attended that consultation, are set out for Cabinet.

It is clear that there is a very uneducated and arrogant attitude in Wellington that is stuck in current thinking and ways of doing things and is failing to keep step with the changes that are being enabled by new technology, new awareness and new mindset thinking that many people in NZ are embracing.

Wake up Wellington you are being left behind. Surely it is better to be part of the solution than to try and stop a tide that is unstoppable?

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. Set out in the summary and the other submissions I have made herein.