

**A New Global Compact:
*Positive Visions of the 21st Century:***

Kia ora koutou

Thank you very much for the welcome and for your kind introduction. It's an honour to be here again, and I'd like to thank the New Zealand Institute for International Affairs for your invitation.

[Acknowledge Kennedy Graham MP and others.]

Tomorrow will be a year to the day, since I last spoke at the NZIIA. An hour-and-a-half before that speech, I stood next to Metiria Turei, Andrew Little and Annette King next door in the Legislative Council Chamber to announce our Memorandum of Understanding to work together to change the Government.

We seem to be developing a habit of scheduling major political announcements on the same day as NZIIA speaking engagements!

Because this morning, Metiria and I announced the ranked list of candidates that the Green Party will be standing at this year's General Election.

Members of this audience may be interested to know that one of those candidates, Golriz Ghahraman, is, at number ten on the list, almost certain to become the first Member of Parliament who started her life in New Zealand as a refugee.

Having fled Iran in 1990 as a child, Golriz is now a human rights lawyer who worked as a prosecutor at the United Nations tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. She also worked on the Khmer Rouge tribunal in Cambodia.

I think maybe next year, we'll ask her to do this speech! In the meantime, I shall do my best to keep up.

Tonight, I'd like to talk about some of the Green perspectives on international affairs, and in particular some of the key challenges - and key opportunities - of our time. A lot has changed since we last spoke.

Many casual observers of international affairs might fairly assume that, right now, there are more challenges than opportunities. They might have a point.

Someone once said, "I think that you will all agree that we are living in most interesting times." That someone was Joseph Chamberlain.

- Populism and demagoguery.
- Paralysis at the United Nations on how to deal with situations like Syria.
- Challenges to the consensus on climate change and how to prevent it from getting worse.

What we need, around the world, in the opening stages of the 21st century, is a good dose of hope.

Not a cross-your-fingers-and-hope-for-the-best kind of hope, but the kind of hope that is born out of our efforts to make things better.

We need to look ahead, to be aware of future dangers and opportunities.

To be compassionate towards one another.

To be respectful of other cultures.

To know when and how to resist increasing arrogance and intolerance.

To pursue the art of stable and lawful strengthening of relations among all our nations – without exception.

There are three key areas that I would like to discuss tonight where I think the opportunities exist amongst the challenges.

1. The first is the challenge of dangerous and irreversible climate change. Everyone here will be familiar with the science. It's the very definition of existential crisis. But we are presented with the task of using this crisis as a chance to transition to a fairer, cleaner economy.
2. Secondly, events which undermine the international commitment to the rule of law and the authority of the United Nations. The use of force without concern for consensus among UN member states is a dangerous precedent to set.

3. And finally the concern we all feel at the rise of populism in nations that we have previously looked to as strong examples of tolerance and openness. Populism which promotes the idea that we should close borders, restrict trade and reject diversity.

What we are calling for is a new global compact for the 21st century.

We believe that such a global compact can emerge from the existing values and principles articulated in recent UN declarations; through reform of the United Nations; and the critical ingredients – political vision, and will.

But we also believe that if we do not proactively develop such a new global compact, then the existing world order will collapse under the strain of planetary stress and the political convulsions arising from that, and a new compact will only emerge from the ashes – perhaps.

We would obviously prefer the former – an orderly transition – rather than the latter, a disorderly one.

So then what kind of policies would the Green Party seek to effect in a coalition government, after 23rd September this year? Particularly in relation to those three challenges – climate change, the rule of law, and populism?

Climate protection

We obviously affirm the 2015 Paris Agreement which calls for net-zero greenhouse gas emissions, globally, in the second half of the 21st century, in order to limit global warming to 2°C.

But, for the sake of our children, the Green Party is in favour of a strong interpretation of the Paris Agreement.

The Paris Agreement also says that 'developed countries should continue to take the lead'. This requires developed countries to achieve national net-zero emissions in the early stages of that half-century.

Our political opponents think that we can put off that goal until later. I do not believe that is morally right or even economically astute.

Last month, a cross-Parliament, all-party group of 34 MPs commissioned leading international research agency, Vivid Economics, to report on New Zealand's emissions pathways.

It concluded that, while eye-wateringly ambitious, it is entirely possible for New Zealand to achieve net-zero domestic emissions by 2050.

We embrace that possibility.

We shall do everything within our power to realise that possibility.

In our view, there is actually really no other credible scenario, in the global interest.

A Green Government in 2017 would set the goal of net-zero emissions by 2050.

To that end, we shall legislate for an independent climate commission whose function will be to develop five-yearly emission budgets from 2021 to 2050, with a transition period of 2018 to 2020.

The Commission will pass such budgets to the Government whose job it will be to develop policy measures, to achieve emissions reductions within those budgets.

We are also interested in pursuing bilateral deals with developing countries to assist them reach their own Paris targets. But that would not be at the expense of domestic emissions neutrality.

The precise policy measures to that end can be worked out with partners in a coalition. I am not worried about our joint ability to ensure that a reduction in gross emissions and increase in sequestration can be achieved.

In order to make a tangible commitment to tackling climate change, however, we will have to change the Government.

National have not been strong on the long term challenges we face as a nation.

New Zealand's carbon emissions have been steadily increasing, now 20 percent higher than they were when National came to power nine years ago.

National's failure to take any meaningful economic action on the climate means we're on track to have to pay for other countries to act in our place.

And it's going to cost us a lot in the future.

Last week we revealed Cabinet briefing papers that estimate that the cost of National's inaction on the climate to be, on average, about \$1 billion dollars a year from 2021-2030, to buy carbon credits abroad.

And that's at today's carbon prices. If carbon prices increase dramatically, we'll be exposed to a bill that makes our looming Superannuation deficit look small by comparison.

Just today, Joseph Stiglitz and Nicholas Stern issued a warning that carbon prices will need to quadruple and sooner rather than later. They say that, by 2020, carbon prices need to be between \$US40 and \$80 (\$NZ56-\$113) and, by 2030, between \$US50 to \$100 (\$NZ71-\$142).

We still have a small window of opportunity left to act. New Zealand's got the resources and the clean energy expertise to meet the climate challenge and show the world how.

This is, in fact, one of the great economic opportunities of our lifetimes that National is simply allowing to pass us by while they have their heads buried under the sea looking for more oil.

Here's how we'd stage our shift towards carbon neutrality:

1. As I mentioned, we'd establish a climate commission to take the carbon accounting out of the hands of the politicians and into the hands of experts.
2. Set a stronger price on carbon and set a likely price path to give business the stable and predictable operating environment that it needs in order to be able plan and invest (or divest).
3. Phase the biggest polluters, like agriculture, into the carbon pricing plan.
4. Set in place positive government incentives to help soften the transition (like a climate tax cut) and provide the capital (like a Green Investment Bank).
5. Set the standards needed to drive energy efficiency, the growth in renewables, and the changes to our towns and cities, and the transport networks that service them.
6. Help fund the R&D needed to speed up the transition and create the valuable IP we can sell to the rest of the world.

Of course, combating climate change is about more than just nurturing a greener economy.

It is a commitment that we have made alongside hundreds of other nations to work together in our common interest, and in the interest of generations to come.

A Green Government would also put climate change front and centre in our trade policy and our approach to any future negotiations.

From our perspective, well-designed and fair trade is good for people around the world and climate change is the greatest economic threat (and opportunity) we face.

We need to start to integrate our thinking so that trade is put to use to both improve living standards and combat climate change.

This means not agreeing to provisions in trade agreements that might undermine government's rights to regulate to support climate action. Or it might mean looking at ways to prevent 'free riders' who do not live up to their obligations under the Paris agreement to reduce their emissions.

Putting our money where our mouth is on climate change reflects our commitment to the rule of law, which is the second challenge I'm going to speak to this evening.

The Rule of law

New Zealand does need a stronger national policy with respect to the rule of law over global affairs. The Green Party in government will immediately introduce two practical policy measures.

The first is the ratification of the 2010 Kampala Amendment to the Rome Statute, which makes aggression a justiciable leadership crime in domestic law.

New Zealand has proven to be a laggard in this respect, falling behind leading States such as Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Spain, Portugal and Samoa.

This would make it a crime for our Prime Minister, including a Green Prime Minister, to commit NZ troops to combat, if it is not compatible with the UN Charter.

Secondly, New Zealand will advance specific proposals for reform of the UN Security Council, including circumscription of the veto.

We would actively support and promote a protocol under which the Permanent Five members undertake not to exercise the veto in situations when mass atrocities are being committed.

France and other countries have been active in this area and New Zealand should be doing more.

The crisis in Syria has demonstrated the scale of the human cost when the veto is not constrained.

We also believe that urgent effort is needed to put nuclear disarmament back at the top of the global agenda.

New Zealand has shown some leadership in the negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, and I acknowledge the Government for that. The Convention will amount to a total prohibition on nuclear weapons – possession, deployment and use.

A Green Government will be one of the first to ratify and promote the Treaty when it is concluded.

We know that the major powers oppose such a treaty. They opposed the nuclear-free zones as well from the 1960s to the '90s. Yet these were concluded successfully in Latin America, the South Pacific, Africa, and South-East Asia, in defiance.

It is time that the hollow promises of the nuclear powers to continue nuclear disarmament negotiation in good faith (which a legally-binding obligation under the Non-Proliferation Treaty) are exposed.

Even if the nuclear powers do not immediately consent to such a treaty, it still will enter into force under international law.

Nuclear disarmament is an area where New Zealanders can look at their history and feel proud.

The importance of that should not be understated.

Populism and the importance of multilateralism

Finally, I would like to turn to the question of political leadership and the challenge of populism.

We want to show leadership on the international stage on issues that New Zealanders feel strongly about.

That means doing more than just talking up the potential for trade deals to solve complex political problems.

We believe that the political upheaval across Europe and the United States is an opportunity as well as a challenge.

We have the opportunity to speak loudly and clearly about our values and what we will do to protect and promote them.

To reject demagoguery outright, instead of demurring that it is simply “not what we would do”.

Many of you here, like me, would have felt relief at recent electoral results in Europe.

Extremist populist and nationalist movements did not extend their reach further into democratic societies. That is a welcome sign.

We are grateful to continue to have liberal democracies we can look to as allies in Canada, France, Germany and elsewhere in Europe. Those alliances remain as important as ever.

That does not mean that we do not have significant differences of opinion and priority. Clearly we do, not least on the question of climate change and our mutual commitments under the Paris agreement.

But what matters more is that we can have a reasonable, facts-based debate about the issues that are important to us with our fellow democracies. We can negotiate. We can compromise, where we need to. And we can collaborate to find solutions.

In light of recent upheavals around the world we are grateful for that.

We are hopeful that in the upcoming election, New Zealand will reject any appeals to an imaginary past world. A world in which we didn't have to navigate how to live with people who are different from us.

I believe that in the upcoming election, we have the opportunity to make a bold choice to stand with those liberal democracies around the world that remain, well, liberal. To lead rather than follow. An Aotearoa New Zealand that is open and inclusive, not closed and intolerant.

Thankfully, Kiwis have a pretty good record on working together.

We believe that looking after people who live here and looking after the planet we live on is the best way to keep that tradition – and hope – alive.

Thank you.