
From: Anne Stieger [REDACTED]
Sent: October 28, 2019 11:42 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Cc: Premier; kody@kodyblois.ca
Subject: Input Bill 213, Sustainable Development Goals Act

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL / COURRIEL EXTERNE ****

Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links / Faites preuve de prudence si vous ouvrez une pièce jointe ou cliquez sur un lien

Dear members of the NS Legislature,

I am writing to provide further input for Bill 213.

I am a young entrepreneur and business counsellor, 32 years old and living in rural Nova Scotia.

This feedback is based on the bill cited as introduced here, as that was the latest version I could find :
https://nslegislature.ca/legc/bills/63rd_2nd/1st_read/b231.htm?fbclid=IwAR3HJLXxwJY3fwmraG0N7Rp1_Ucam_DI5LD8ZLRbk8t-KJ64IHu8dfEuV74

(In the future, more clarity on updates accepted from first hearings would be much appreciated, to ensure citizens can provide informed input!)

First of all, I would like to highlight that the Legislature, in the future, needs to give more notice to all citizens to provide input - posting this on a Friday afternoon quietly and having the hearing the following Monday is not acceptable, and not supportive of a strong, healthy democracy.

Secondly, I would like to say that I appreciate many of the efforts made in this act, including the reference to the sustainable development goals, concept of inclusive economy and Netukulimk.

A few things I am concerned about, and suggestions to make this bill stronger:

-
- Section 7 - targets
- -
 - **7b**
 - - **the suggested target is too low** - I would like to see
 - a target of at least 50% below 1990 levels by 2030. This is in line with the 2030 Declaration already signed by many Nova Scotian organizations, including many that represent youth (who will have to live with the consequences of our current (in)actions)
 - https://ecologyaction.ca/sites/default/files/images-documents/2030%20Declaration%20with%20Signatories%20-%20Aug%2027_0.pdf

-
-
- 7c
- - this phrasing is ambiguous - I agree that we need to be net zero by then, but I would suggest that it include a further reduction target and/or emissions limit, as well.
- We need to further reduce emissions after 2030 and then also use offsets to then arrive at net zero (e.g. measure outlined here
- <https://www.drawdown.org/>)
-
-
- I say this for 2 reasons
-

-
- We need to plan for lag
- effects in the complex system of the climate which we are impacting, thus it would be safe to plan for a “buffer” of additional reduction
-
-
- This poses an amazing opportunity
- for Nova Scotia to be a leader in sustainability for rural places - and would allow us to create a strong, thriving, green nova scotian economy that would allow us to break free from the vicious cycle we are currently in that is based on unlimited growth &
- measured by GDP (which is long established to be impossible on a finite planet); that system currently “forces” decision-makers to give natural resources to extraction business in return for jobs or money. Imagine a NS where we are leaders in Green Economy,
- having created a new sustainable economic model that allows us to thrive as a province! This is our opportunity to set us up strongly for this shift, and to make it a just transition!
-

-
- "Netukulimk - does meeting this principle
- mean we uphold all of the tenants in the treaties? If not, the act needs to include this. The treaty is much more specific and we have not held up our end of this historically.

-
-
-
-
-
- Section 9a (communities
- fund)

-
- This is a great idea as
- supports will be needed for this transition. Bridgewater is a great example of what is possible here to support not only communities, but also citizens individually, to ensure this transition is just for all.
- <http://www.energizebridgewater.ca/>
-
-
- I would like to see bolder
- steps here, not only using tax dollars to support this transition, but also forcing large businesses who are big resource users or polluters to be part of the solution: businesses need to start carrying the true costs of their operations (incl. Environmental
- costs & clean-up which are currently often left to tax dollars)
-

-
- Section 8d and 2a - clean
- inclusive growth & circular economy
-
-
- 2a - the concept of circular
- economy and clean growth (8d) are a decent start, but they are counter-intuitive to the fact that we need to act fast and make big shifts - this will include shifts in the models and mindset we use to measure economic success.
-
-
- So long as we keep referring
- to growth, and measure success via GDP, we will not be able to start living within the scientifically well-established planetary boundaries (see University of Stockholm here:
- <https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/planetary-boundaries/planetary-boundaries/about-the-research/the-nine-planetary-boundaries.html>)
-
-
- Thus, let's stop using the
- word "growth." (8d) the concept of infinite growth is counter to the fact that we have planetary and resource limits. The concept comes from the financial market economy, which does not account for paying for or managing 'externalities' like waste, pollution
- or CO2 emissions. This means using this term while trying to lower CO2 emissions is counter-intuitive. "Growth" should be replaced with "thriving" to ensure that we grow the economy within planetary limits. The model that's most helpful for understanding this
- today is the Doughnut Economy - see links below
-
-
-
- Circular economy (2a) is

- not comprehensive enough for the complexity of our economic and climatic systems, and it is still extraction based; let's look at regenerative economy! Circular economy seems to leave many loopholes. For example, under the circular economy, couldn't coal continue
- to be mined and shipped other places? Wouldn't it still be ok to use massive amounts of energy (and CO2 emissions) to recycle plastic and put more of it out into the environment? It places no limits on how much pollution can be put into the environment while
- recycling things?
- - The
 - Doughnut model is more descriptive in terms of providing what we need within the planetary boundaries
 - <https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/>.
 -
 -
 - brief
 - article here <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/apr/12/doughnut-growth-economics-book-economic-model>
 -
 -
 - and
 - TED talk here https://www.ted.com/talks/kate_raworth_a_healthy_economy_should_be_designed_to_thrive_not_grow?language=en
 -

Overall, my ask is that we set more ambitious targets now to shape a fast & fair transition towards living within the planetary boundaries. Stop telling us it's not possible – it's a matter of the will-power of politicians to stand up for what is needed to provide a liveable future for your citizens - and as a young citizen (Im 32), I expect that the government will do its job to protect a liveable future for me, my nieces, and my unborn children.

Thank you for your time and work on this. We're all in this together, living in the same economy, breathing the same air, and drinking the same water.

Thanks kindly,
Anne Stieger