

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Lynda Williams

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? Yes

1b. What is most important to you?

The most important objective is that NZ must make up for its appalling history of not doing enough to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by making a very ambitious contribution. NZ must lead the world that way it has led the world in other important global issues which include granting women the right to vote, opposing racism, saying no to nuclear testing in the Pacific, refusing to allow nuclear powered or armed ships into our harbours, and pursuing independent foreign policies.

Our contribution should be one that is universally seen as VERY ambitious and one that makes up for our past unacceptable inaction.

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?

The consultation document is full of excuses for why NZ hasn't done more, and is extremely biased against making an acceptable contribution.

NZ must commit to a target of reducing our total emissions by 20% by 2020, and commit to a global and NZ zero carbon target by 2050 or sooner. It's our past inaction that must be taken into account not the "nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy." The future of our children and grandchildren and their grandchildren is at stake here, and we must take big strides to catch up to what we should have started doing in the early 1990s. For example, the governments of the day since 1990 should have insisted that a tree was planted for every tree that was cut down. And refused consent for dairy farms to be established in areas where it is environmentally inappropriate for them to be, eg my home province of Hawkes Bay, and in the south of the South Island. The constantly falling dairy prices should be regarded as a wake up call to do the right thing by the environment and move away from being so dependent on agriculture.

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?

There is no "appropriate cost." What matters most in this debate is the cost of NOT reducing all our greenhouse gas emissions, something that the discussion document does not address.

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



Copy of your submission

The longer NZ procrastinates (which is what the discussion document is actually advocating) the higher the cost of taking more radical action further down the track. Why should the current generation pass the huge costs of meeting the targets we should have set and begun working towards 25 years ago onto future generations?

The government is not asking the right questions! This question should be "How will our contribution affect FUTURE New Zealanders?"

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?

Another stupid question! It is not about what is most likely to occur, but what should be mandated to occur.

NZ must move extremely rapidly to improve public transport and subsidise electric vehicles.

NZ must quickly reduce its dependence on environmentally unsustainable agriculture and invest in a wide range of other green technologies that it can market to the world.

Summary

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

NZ shouldn't bother trying to take this into account. Instead we need a government that is brave enough to take a leadership role on the world stage and stop making lame excuses for why we haven't done better, and why we can't do better.

The benefits - environmentally, physically, ethically, morally, spiritually and yes, of course financially, - will in the end outweigh the short term pain of getting back on track.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.

Yes, there sure is. I want EVERY Member of Parliament to watch the documentary "Hot Air," and then set about putting the past wrongs and lack of action to right. Our grandchildren and great grandchildren are all depending on us. So stop being so cowardly.