

# **SIMON REEVES**

## **BARRISTER AND SOLICITOR**

7<sup>th</sup> floor, 43 High Street  
Auckland, New Zealand

e-mail: [rethink@xtra.co.nz](mailto:rethink@xtra.co.nz)  
mobile 021 950 236

P O Box 90-150  
AUCKLAND N.Z.

TELEPHONE (09) 379 8594  
FACSIMILE (09) 379 8016

SIMON ERIC KNIGHT REEVES  
LL.B. (Auckland), LL.M. (Virginia)  
Hon. NZIA

DX CP21516  
Lower Queen Street

14 March 2008

The Minister of Conservation  
Parliament Buildings  
**WELLINGTON**

Dear Minister

re the Arapawa Goats

Thank you for your interest in the matter of the Arapawa goats and their safe passage to a secure future. I have made some points below which I hope will assist you in your efforts in finding a block of Crown land from the Conservation estate which the most unique and threatened of them could be placed as the basis of a specially devised gene bank for the now and for future generations. Speaking broadly there is no reason why the Kaimanawa wild horses could not also be relocated to such a piece of land where their genes could also be scientifically protected, enhanced and recorded for now and for future generations as well.

**THE CASE for PROTECTING and PRESERVING the GENE BASES of all of the ENDANGERED NATIVE, and other SPECIES of MAMMALS of NEW ZEALAND**

### **The United Nations' Convention on Biological Diversity 1992**

By the 1992 United Nations' Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) New Zealand became responsible with 190 other member nations to recognise the "biodiversity" of all life on Earth – biodiversity such as makes this, our home, the extraordinary and uniquely habitable place it is. It came into effect on 29 December 1993. New Zealand has played a leading role in its implementation and our contribution has been unique as regards the clever recovery of very endangered avian species such as the Chatham Islands' Black Robin, the Kakapo, the Kokako and now the Riroriro or Fairy Tern.

At the time of the CBD it was estimated that since Columbus 500 years ago some 50-100 species have been disappearing *every day* which is a staggering degree of extinction which is impossible to comprehend. As is written in the useful website Wikipedia "*The convention recognized for the first time in international law that the conservation of biological diversity is "a common concern of humankind" and is an integral part of the development process. The agreement covers all ecosystems, species, and genetic resources. It links traditional conservation efforts to the economic goal of using biological resources sustainably. It sets principles for the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, notably those destined for commercial use.*

At issue here is the fate of every form of life on Earth of all kinds including *genetic*, viral, floral, faunal and their related avian and terrestrial relations from flowers to trees, from flies to frogs.

Such life forms as are seemingly commonplace in the farmyard can easily be included in the lists of animals which member nations must work to protect and preserve. If only as future gene banks – about which we know now much more than in 1992 – “common and garden” animals must be given the benefit of the doubt and be kept extant rather than be destroyed or allowed simply to die out. We can no longer be the cause of the end of their historic gene line.

In New Zealand that of course includes all breeds of “introduced” fauna including wild as well as farmed animals such as sheep and goats. Because their paths to safety diverge at a point later in this discussion it is important here to define their nature and roles.

As regards the wild mammals which cause such damage to our unique flora the term “indigenous” pertains to those species which are “native” or “belonging naturally” to an area - in our case to New Zealand as a whole.<sup>1</sup> In his *New Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language*<sup>2</sup> Webster provides another definition of “indigenous” as “originating or produced naturally in a country or climate; native, not foreign or exotic”. He variously defines an “indigenene” as being “One born in a country”; a native animal or plant”. Both words find their root in the Latin *indigena* which he describes as a combination of “old form of” and “beget” hence an old or earliest creation by begetting.

The definitions are important because there are those who would say that “native” animals were automatically “indigenous” and others who would argue that being “native” means simply “born” and “pertaining to the place or circumstances of one’s birth”; “one born in a place or country, and not a foreigner or immigrant” without at all being “indigenous”. Hence at a human level of status the United States Constitution allows for all American citizens to rise from log cabin to the White House *as long as they were born in the United States*. To be the president of that country one does not have to be “indigenous” or “aboriginal”<sup>3</sup> but certainly a “native” being in that case someone *born there*.

In New Zealand it is accepted that Maori are indigenous and also native. All settlers from Europe since before and after the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi are able to be considered to be “native” if born here but unable to be considered to be “aboriginal” because they have not been here from the beginning and/or were not the first people to settle here.

---

1 From The New Zealand Pocket Oxford Dictionary (1986) at p. 382.

2 Ibid., at p. 436.

3 Or "aborigine" which is literally from the Latin *ab origine* – from the beginning.

With fauna there is a similar classification possible. As is discussed below the protection to be afforded to "native" mammals here differs from that for "indigenous" animals only by reason of the special reference contained in Annex 1 of the CBD discussed in the section on the species "not of New Zealand" *post*.

### "Sustainability" in New Zealand

Not only have we in New Zealand bound ourselves as a High Contracting Party to the CBD but we have also adopted internal responsibilities under various statutes enacted here with the intention to achieve "sustainability". Our contemporaneously negotiated Resource Management Act's [RMA] purpose and its discipline of "sustainable management" [S. 5(2) RMA] is now mandated by the CBD's underlying "principle" of the "sustainable development" of life forms, a slogan which we in New Zealand have domestically adopted as "management". Even our 1987 Conservation Act evoked a similar ethic of advocacy and therefore a good degree of "protection" of our "natural resources".<sup>4</sup> "Nature Conservation" is defined by that Act as meaning the "preservation *and protection* of the natural resources of New Zealand *having regard to their intrinsic values and having special regard to indigenous flora and fauna, natural eco-systems, and landscape*" (emphasis added).

Such "protection" does not relate solely to fate of the wildlife which are referred to in the Act as being "protected wildlife" as defined as such by s. 2(1). It includes and means in relation to a resource, *its maintenance, so far as is practicable, in its current state; but includes (a) Its restoration to some former state; and (b) Its augmentation, enhancement, or expansion* (again, emphasis added).

In the light of our modern knowledge of gene pools, markers and DNA analysis itself it is arguable that what might be "sustainable" and "managed" depends to a degree on the "availability" of the gene base concerned and the logistical ability to carry out our obligations. Without the available gene base we have no ability to achieve either sustainable management or sustainable development both of which we have agreed to at home and abroad.

Moreover, the degree of any threat to a gene source should demand a concomitant response. Where the species concerned allows for ease of protection and encouragement then the burden will be lighter and any official excuses against its survival less plausible.

Therefore, where the present importance of a genotype might not be known with any precision (if at all) it is incumbent on member States to conserve their biological diversity and protect rather than eliminate or create adverse habitat conditions.

If there is a possibility/probability that a gene base might be lost forever our obligation nationally and internationally becomes even higher.

---

4 S. 2(1) of the Conservation Act 1987 defines "Natural resources" *inter alia* as meaning:

- (a) Plants and animals of all kinds; and
  - (b) The air, water, and soil in or on which any plant or animal lives or may live; and
  - (e) Systems of interacting living organisms, and their environment;
- and includes any interest in a natural resource

## The Stockholm Declaration 1972

Further underlying principles and obligations which were recognised 20 years previously at history's first intergovernmental environmental conference (Stockholm, 1972) include the principle not to harm the environments of other member States or the international commons. In 1992 Principle 21 of the Stockholm Declaration was "enacted" into "hard law" by Article 3 of the CBD whereby that principle "grew" from being mere "customary" or soft or informal law of a Declaration to become the enforceable precept of Article 3 as important at international law as any other part of that Treaty.

That affects us in New Zealand because of our implicit acceptance of the need to protect that part of the international commons which might occur within our national boundaries just as we must care for the air which we breathe and the waters which fill our harbours and rivers. Given that the CBD could be said to include a considerable breadth of jurisdictional interest – the whole of life on Earth – that "graduation" from Principle 21 to Article 3 is arguably its greatest feature.

It is also arguable that the "international environment" means not only the environment beyond the sovereign territories of member nations but the inhabitants, the flora and fauna, within and of sovereign nations which are mobile or which have anyway been accepted as being the responsibility of (if not always within the physical grasp of) the host High Contracting Party by its accession to the CBD. And by Principle 21/Article 3 *any* act of a High Contracting Party (which is therefore an advocate of the Stockholm Declaration as well as the CBD) which might adversely affect the environment of another member state by the transnational effects of the use of *e.g.* fossil fuels to cause climate change or persistent organic pollutants (POPs)<sup>5</sup> and therefore species' or biodiversity loss should be sufficient to be in breach of the CBD without it needing to affect *only* the international commons or indeed possibly without any flora and fauna in either a state or in the international commons being likewise affected, only the gene pools generally.

At first glance it might have been thought that the Wildlife Act 1953 and the Conservation Act 1987 were free of any constraints such as Principle 21. However, because of the strength and general acceptance of that Declaration and its "codification" into the CBD 20 years later the contrary must surely be the case. Possibly because they both predated the RMA, the CBD and the Fisheries Act 1996 the purposes of the Wildlife Act and of the Conservation Act are not so clearly defined. The fact is, however, that the Stockholm Declaration was abroad up to some 20 years before the Conservation Act and our accession to both the Declaration and the Principle must mean that its injunction that the environment of the international commons must not be adversely affected would have been influential on their drafting. The Conservation Act's declared "functions" include

*to administer this Act and the enactments specified in the First Schedule to this Act, and, **subject to this Act and those enactments and to the directions (if any) of the Minister:***

*(a) To **manage for conservation purposes, all land, and all other natural and historic resources, for the time being held under this Act, and all other land and natural and historic resources whose owner agrees with the Minister that they should be managed by the Department;** ....and:*

*(b) To **advocate the conservation of natural and historic resources generally:***

---

<sup>5</sup> As proscribed by the 2001 Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

In other words New Zealand signed up to a 1972 Declaration and a 1992 Treaty which together – or even now just the CBD – require us to be very careful to ensure that any of our actions (including seemingly unrelated activities as using the gene bases of ancient rotted vegetative oils for transport) do not cause the loss of biodiversity under our control and in our jurisdiction including by any disruption of its gene pool.

### **The precautionary principle**

Post-Rio the underlying “driver” which is now applicable to the CBD is what has become known as “the precautionary principle” which demands caution when a definitive outcome may not positively be assessable at the time of debate or even afterwards.

Therefore, where the present importance of a genotype might not be known with any precision (if at all) it is incumbent on all such Parties to conserve their biological diversity and protect rather than eliminate it or create adverse habitat conditions.

That obligation as underscored by the precautionary principle is a concept which is not unknown to us in New Zealand where the RMA, the Fisheries Act 1996 and Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 all provide that where there is a threat of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity, a lack of full scientific certainty cannot be used as a reason to postpone measures to avoid or minimize such a threat. For instance, all persons who would wish to fish in New Zealand waters are governed by the Fisheries Act 1996 s. 9(b) of which requires that the “*biological diversity* of the aquatic environment should be maintained”.

More particularly s.10 of that Act requires requiring “information principles” that

*All persons exercising or performing functions, duties, or powers under this Act, in relation to the utilisation of fisheries resources or **ensuring sustainability**, shall take into account the following information principles:*

- (a) *Decisions should be based on the **best available information**:*
- (b) *Decision makers should consider any **uncertainty** in the information available in any case:*
- (c) ***Decision makers should be cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable, or inadequate:***
- (d) ***The absence of, or any uncertainty in, any information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take any measure to achieve the purpose of this Act.** <*

Similarly, the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 also includes a specific requirement to observe the precautionary approach in its s. 7:

*Precautionary approach---All persons exercising functions, powers, and duties under this Act, including but not limited to, functions, powers, and duties under sections 29, 32, 38, 45, and 48 of this Act, **shall take into account the need for caution in managing adverse effects where there is scientific and technical uncertainty about those effects.** (emphasis added)*

Although neither the Wildlife Act nor the Conservation Act refers to such precautionary ideas nor imposes such obligations as “best available information” or indeed “any uncertainty in information available” the possible uncertainty, unreliability, or inadequacy of information or the absence or uncertainty should not now be used by persons acting

under them as "a reason for postponing or failing to take any measure to achieve the purpose of this Act" simply because we have a subsequent adherence to the CBD - and even because of s. 17 RMA which imposes a duty on "every person" in New Zealand to avoid, remedy and mitigate any adverse effect on the environment which are more than merely minor. "Environment" of course means as that word as it is broadly defined by the RMA to therefore include gene pools.

The international community has recognised the necessity to protect Earth's entire gene pool of life as it is regardless of the type of "vessel" in which those genes might travel. Now by our own statutory framework and by our having signed up to those UN compacts both "indigenous" and "native" fauna have to be protected here for the simple necessity to ensure that their genes are safe from extinction worldwide.

If, therefore, the data necessary to evaluate an obligation to ensure the survival of the Kaimanawa wild horses or the wild sheep and goats of Arapawa Island are available they must be used. If there are no data or if data are for whatever reason uncertain or falsely or incompetently achieved then their absence or the delay in getting them to decision-makers must be taken in to account and the precaution taken not to embark upon or partner any extermination – which of course means killing rather than culling - until such data are to hand and decisive.

In the meantime by the treaty enforcement powers of the CBD, even other member states (by the 1972 Declaration) whether or not they might also be signatories to the CBD the onus is on the New Zealand Government as a High Contracting Party to the CBD to ensure the protection of the biodiversity of life forms within its jurisdiction and within the international commons.

### Other formulations of the precautionary principle

Wikipedia provides us with further "formulations" of the precautionary principle such as the 1998 *Wingspread Statement on the Precautionary Principle* which states that "When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or [to] the environment precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically." <sup>6</sup>

Again, in February 2, 2000 the European Commission Communication on the Precautionary Principle noted that "The precautionary principle applies where scientific evidence is insufficient, inconclusive or uncertain and preliminary scientific evaluation indicates that there are reasonable grounds for concern that the **potentially dangerous effects on the environment**, human, **animal** or plant **health** may be **inconsistent** with the **high level of protection** chosen by the EU". <sup>7</sup>

---

6 The Wingspread Conference on the Precautionary Principle was convened by the Science and Environmental Health Network

7 Sourced from Wikipedia as also: Fields typically concerned by the precautionary principle are the possibility of:

- \* Global warming or other sudden climate change
- \* Extinction of species
- \* Introduction of new and potentially harmful products into the environment, threatening biodiversity (e.g., genetically modified organisms)

- 
- \* Threats to public health, due to new diseases and techniques (e.g., AIDS transmitted through blood transfusion)
  - \* Persistent or acute pollution (asbestos, endocrine disruptors...)
  - \* Food safety (e.g., Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease)
  - \* Other new biosafety issues (e.g., artificial life, new molecules)

The Traffic Light colour convention, showing the concept of Harvest Control Rule (HCR), specifying when a rebuilding plan is mandatory in terms of precautionary and limit reference points for spawning biomass and fishing mortality rate.

Several natural resources like fish stocks are now managed by precautionary approach through Harvest Control Rules (HCR) based upon the precautionary principle. The figure indicates how the principle is implemented in the cod fisheries management proposed by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

In classifying endangered species, the precautionary principle means that if there is doubt about an animal's or plant's exact conservation status, the one that would cause the strongest protective measures to be realized should be chosen. Thus, a species like the Silvery Pigeon that might exist in considerable numbers and simply be under-recorded or might just as probably be long extinct is not classified as "data deficient" or "extinct" (which both do not require any protective action to be taken), but as "critically endangered" (the conservation status that confers the need for the strongest protection), whereas the increasingly rare, but probably not yet endangered Emerald Starling is classified as "data deficient", because there is urgent need for research to clarify its status rather than for conservation action to save it from extinction.

***From the Wingspread Statement:***

Normally, no minimal threshold of plausibility is specified as a "triggering" condition, so that even the slightest indication that a particular product or activity might possibly produce some harm to human health or the environment will suffice to invoke the principle. And just as often no other preventative action is contemplated than an outright ban on the incriminated product or activity.

**Criticisms' Perspective.** Critics of the principle argue that it is impractical, since every implementation of a technology carries some risk of negative consequences.

Proponents counter that the principle is not an absolute rule, it is a conceptual tool to clarify arguments, and especially an issue of where the burden of proof lies.

Critics also claim that proponents are sometimes selective in their use of the precautionary principle – applying it for political reasons, rather than scientific reasons. They note that the selective application of principles in government is considered a fundamental form of injustice, which is why selective enforcement is considered an abuse of power.

Proponents counter that acting with insufficient knowledge of risk (e.g., spreading new lifeforms into the biosphere) can also be socially unfair, costly, and detrimental when applied to complex environmental choices. They note that the reckless application of technology is a worse abuse of power.

With many, if not all, of the animals which were imported by human actions into New Zealand unable properly to be assessed and assayed as to their genetic importance it is imperative that where such *non-existent* and “insufficient, inconclusive or uncertain and preliminary scientific evaluation” indicates that there are “reasonable grounds for concern [about] the potentially dangerous effects on the environment [and]...animal ...health” no irreversible acts such as elimination or an end to their gene line should occur – and certainly not at the official level of the governance of a High Contracting Party.

### **Intergenerational equity**

Additionally at Stockholm there was declared the parallel concept of “intergenerational equity” which required member States to take into account the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations when making present “real time” policy decisions. That had been implicit in the mantra of “sustainable development” which had first been raised at the developing nations’ 1971 Founex Conference prior to Stockholm as a way to interest them in environmental protection. Stockholm confirmed it and later in 1987 the IUCN/World Conservation Union and the World Commission on Sustainable Development by the latter’s “Brundtland Report” declared the hoped-for adjectival inclusion of “environmentally” to qualify sustainable development’s otherwise pro-corporate thrust.

Whichever, the fact remains that for anything to be “sustainable” there must be a reason. Environmental and/or corporate initiatives *require* there to be beneficiaries. With an anthropocentric slant as much as with a purely natural world “development” would not therefore be “sustainable” if it were not to result in the continued existence of the thing being sustained and/or the permanent added value to a beneficiary. Otherwise there would be no point.

And to have a beneficiary there must be a continuum of time: an intergenerational “equity” whereby the generations which the life form creates and provides for are equal participants in that development or protection being sustained over time.

Thus there is a legitimate expectation from Founex, from Stockholm’s Declaration, from the WSSD’s Brundtland Report, from the CBD and from our adherence to them and to our own RMA and related statutes that what we do now must not in any way impact on the ability of those generations of life forms which follow present lives in being to the extent that an inequity might ensue. By its s. 5(2) the RMA provides that “sustainable management” shall mean *inter alia* the sustenance of “the potential of natural and physical “resources” ...to **meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations**”.

As with for all other contracting states those United Nations’ compacts and conferences dictate that we must follow that simple intergenerational path and do nothing which might detract or detour from it. Our adherence to those dictates our behaviour now and hereafter.

### **Our responsibility under the CBD to life forms which are not "of New Zealand" since Gondwanaland**

New Zealand's departure from the ancient formation of Gondwanaland left us with a myriad of life forms which has made it unique as regards all other land masses and therefore as regards its responsibilities under the CBD, *etc.*. As discussed above they are able to be considered to be "indigenous" and their descendants both "indigenous" and "native" and required to be protected by the New Zealand Government. However, this discussion relates solely to the official obligations to ensure the protection of those life forms which have been introduced to New Zealand by human agencies as a result of visit and/or settlement here and which can therefore be taken as being "native" to New Zealand if only by reason of their birth here. Thus it covers everything from the Norway rat *Rattus rattus* and the *Kiore* rat from Polynesia to the stately Chamois and Wapiti which were introduced for the specific purpose of big game hunting. As a result "native" fauna are as able to be protected by the CBD, the Stockholm and Rio Declarations and the RMA as if they were also "indigenous" which of course they are not. They came here as wild animals and are able to be protected by those coda for the simple reason that by the above arguments their genes now "belong" to everyone on Earth.

The conflicts arise where such mammals compete with indigenous and equally unique examples of flora all of which make these islands *inter alia* distinct from other, more densely peopled places. The evaluation is almost impossible to settle when the basic gene pool is at stake rather than the "value" of fauna and flora from an anthropocentric viewpoint.

### **The future of previously domesticated animals**

At this point the relevance of the CBD becomes diffuse. It is primarily concerned about the "wild" gene pools of Earth's fauna. It sets out the way in which those pools can be "sustainably developed" a term which can be considered oxymoronic if the designers of the CBD are seen as the promoters of prosaic corporate interests rather than advocates for the survival of life forms generally.

In any event, by its Annex 1's mention of "formerly domesticated species now wilded" the CBD impliedly excludes such mammals from its text. The CBD is concerned about indigenous and native animals and the survival of their genes whilst its Annex 1 provides a lesser but nonetheless important level of reference. Of its own it certainly does nothing to ensure the survival of the Norway Rat or the WhiteTail Deer. It is argued that together with the two historic Declarations and more specific international compacts and its Annex I the CBD seeks to protect *all* animal species including those which presently being farmed (and include rare and endangered breeds which variously are the subject of often intense preservationist efforts around the world.)

Thus those mammals which might earlier have been domesticated over the last 10,000 years since the end of the hunter/gatherer communities but which for some reasons have "escaped" or been released into the wild are also to be protected by the two Declarations and the RMA here and by the CBD by the benefit of Annex 1's "identify and monitor" requirement. Thus the sheep and goat species which continue to inhabit our offshore islands qualify for such a procedure despite the fact that some might fail to persuade the identifiers that their particular gene pools should be considered to be important and therefore needing to be "monitored" hereafter. That is where the precautionary principle

ought to kick in and plead uncertainty = preservation.

Before that decision to monitor were made there would have to be scientifically derived results as to the origin of the species, its domestic provenance and the fact of it now being wild. It would not matter whether the genes of the Annex 1 animals were unique, endangered or otherwise special because the only criteria for their identification and (continued *ad infinitum*) monitoring would be if they came within the obligations and criteria of that Annex.

Thus it is clear from the CBD's Annex 1 that there is a strong degree of protection as regards animals which once were developed from the wild to serve the interests of mankind but since released, *etc.*.

In that regard the importance of the CBD lies not only in its clear confirmation of the role of governments to protect biodiversity of all kinds but particularly to have regard to those species which have "gone bush" or which have been released from human control sometimes – if not always – with disastrous results to flora everywhere in New Zealand and its offshore islands.

Annex 1 of the CBD notes the relevance of protection of such life forms to biodiversity when it calls upon the Parties such as the New Zealand Government to "identify and monitor" such previously domesticated but now wilded species.

If nothing else protects them (which is denied) that Annex imposes on the New Zealand Government a protective element towards those (possibly unpopular) constituents of our resident biodiversity, a call to identify *and* monitor which implies a conservationist rather than an "eliminational" burden. The responsibility arises only conjunctively and only to previously domesticated species. Possums and Thar, Rats and Chamois would simply need to be identified and, if domestic ordinances such as controlling statutes like the Wildlife Act applied, eliminated as destructive pests provided of course that the international ability of their genes was guaranteed.

With them Annex 1 would not apply to impose any obligation on the New Zealand Government. On the other hand, where the animal had been domesticated such as the Horse or the Sheep then the CBD duty would come into play and, after having identified them as such, the High Contracting Party would have then to "monitor" them and their descendants.

It is surely arguable that a duty to monitor can only accompany a policy of protection. One doesn't monitor something in order to destroy it but instead to check on its presence and perhaps cull where no lateral destruction of the gene base would occur. I suggest that outcome because "monitor" could mean an obligation to ensure that the previously domesticated Sheep or Goat did not become destructive by its presence or its numbers. Annex 1 for to that acknowledge that such previously domesticated animals are part of Earth's biosphere and if nothing else as such creatures "at large" they have much to offer us as a continuum of anthropocentrically desired genetic knowledge.

And the reference to them as the first part of the first Annex must signify some importance as to their role in the spectrum of biota which the Treaty seeks to protect. It places them in a kind of half-way house of protection and yet control. It certainly does not anticipate their elimination as variant genotypes. Otherwise it would have said so. It does not.

## Summary

Since Stockholm we have included principles of environmental protection some of which such as its Principle 21 have become enforceable law. We have also espoused the precautionary principle and its related concept of intergenerational equity.

In New Zealand we then adopted all such responsibilities in our Resource Management Act 1992 by its s. 5(2) which provides that "sustainable management" shall mean *inter alia* the sustenance of "the potential of natural and physical resources" ... "to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations" now and hereafter.

So by our own domestic legislation we are further statutorily bound to sustain whilst recognising that we might not necessarily have all of the answers and that there might be some unknowns about which we should take care to conserve, protect and, if necessary, bottle away somewhere until "needed on the voyage" like some steamship luggage of last century's travellers.

And by the Convention on Biological Diversity and its New Zealand action plan Theme 4 we have accepted responsibility for Earth's gene base wherever it might be found – including in those animals which were once domesticated by human intervention but which have since become part of the wild. To those latter species we now owe a duty to "identify and monitor" which can only mean a preservationist approach – if only to ensure that by their having become wild we might have something to gain from their amended gene pool for our own wise use.

As regards those animals in New Zealand which were "wild" when imported into these islands for hunting and game purposes their main (if only) source of protection must be the various and wider interest in preserving and protecting Earth's gene pool as evidenced by the United Nations' (and the New Zealand Government's) Declarations, the Biodiversity Convention and our own RMA.

Simon Reeves (LL.B. (Auckland); LL.M. (Virginia))

Legal adviser to the Rare Breeds Society of New Zealand  
 Author, International Encyclopaedia of Environmental Law of New Zealand  
 Member, New Zealand Government Delegation to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED/the Earth Summit), Rio 1992  
 Official Youth Observer, United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) Stockholm, 1972

14 March 2008  
 00018134