To whom it may concern,

I am e-mailing you a typed version of the points I made verbally last night at the public consultation meeting in Rotorua. I was the mother with the young boy who spoke third.

Please read below a faithful summary of my words (which I basically read) from that meeting. I hope that these will be published along with the records from all the other consultation meetings.

Yours faithfully,
Jenny Lux.

My response to the discussion document:

- New Zealand needs to aim for at least a 40% reduction in emissions from 1990 levels by 2030.
- Why have no calculations been done of the damage to our economy that climate change will cause at various levels of emissions reductions, including the “business as usual” scenario? Increased floods, droughts, sea level rise, loss of land, health effects… these need to be factored in. These are HUGE omissions from the analysis. The economic analysis presented is SO shortsighted and simplistic as to be laughable. To frame the whole question as “what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?” is so naïve. It’s analogous to asking a sick patient whether they’ll commit to treatment options ranging from $20 to $100 a week, without explaining to them that if they don’t do anything they’re facing permanent disability.
- We MUST commit to reducing our domestic emissions and not simply expect to be able to offset them all through offshore market partners. The discussion document talks about how we have a large proportion of our emissions from agriculture, how we are currently efficient producers and little can be done to reduce emissions from agriculture. However, we continue to increase the area of unsustainable dairy farms! We should be limiting the amount land converted to dairy rather than jumping in boots and all with government-owned companies. For example, Landcorp's Wairakei Pastoral development near Taupo aims to create 39 dairy farms with 42,000 cows by 2021, mostly on land that was in forestry. Dairy conversions like this deliver a double whammy – the intense farming methods increase GHG emissions and felling pine forests decreases gases sequestered. Further dairy conversions by government are just greedy and unwise from a climate change point of view, not to mention the horrific nutrient run-off from such developments. We need to be diversifying our economy. Conventional dairying is not a low carbon option, but organic dairying possibly could be. Let’s think outside the square and look at the opportunities.
The discussion document uses words like “appropriate”, “fair & ambitious” in helping us to decide what would be the right level to commit to. When faced with an unequivocal scenario of devastation, the only appropriate response is to take decisive action. We cannot dither any more. We’ve dithered too long, and World Bank predictions show that the longer we wait the worse the cost will be on future generations. I have two boys, now 5 and 7. I don’t think it’s fair for us to burn up their world.

The document mentions that costs and impacts on society should be managed fairly and appropriately. This means we should not be favouring unsustainable agriculture by leaving it out of the ETS. This is UNFAIR.

We need a clear domestic policy to reduce the carbon footprint of conventional agriculture, especially unsustainable dairy farms, and we need to stimulate low emissions sectors of the economy (e.g. forestry, local manufacturing, organic and biological agriculture, technology). These are not listed as options in your discussion document but should be. I don’t agree with an increase in agricultural production at the expense of a stable climate.

We need to have our national emissions targets in domestic law, as they have in the U.K. in the Climate Change Act. We need to stop treating climate change like a political football, and enshrine our commitments in law. A matter of such importance really needs to be depoliticised.