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Dear Sir or Madam

The New Zealand submission for climate change, while taking into account that there is currently a growing swell of support for the reduction in man made CO2 emissions, has nothing whatsoever to do with climate change, our submission must be the minimum we can obtain for New Zealand.

The world’s climate has always changed and always will. It has nothing whatsoever to do with CO2 emissions by man. CO2 is a minor gas in the world’s atmosphere (about 0.3%) and mankind’s contribution to it is again about 0.3%. Nature’s contribution is far, far greater. Nothing man does will change climate. The cause of climate change is variation in the sun’s activity.

Notwithstanding this you have asked for submissions on NZ’s position at the forthcoming December 2015 Paris meeting. Contributions to this and other UNFCCC meetings has concentrated on the comparative undertakings by nations to reduce CO2 emissions with no respect whatsoever to the scientific basis for so doing. This is scientific rubbish. However, as we must contribute to this farce, I believe our approach should concentrate on the minimum amount we can possibly contribute as a country. It is only a short time away before this farce is recognised globally and the meaningless nonsense of trying to curb anthropogenic CO2 production is recognised.

In answer to the five questions contained in your discussion document my comments are:

Q 1.
We should look to setting a low, long term limit for NZ’s CO2 emissions. Most importantly we should aim to minimise NZ’s undertakings and look to the longer term. We should aim for NZ’s undertaking to be in the lower 10% of nations. There is no point in leading a ‘charge of the light brigade’.

In direct answer to your question I do agree with your approach of causing as little financial harm as possible to our country.

Q2.
We should try to set our level of CO2 emissions so as to not cause any adverse affects on our economy.

Q3.
The financial effect on NZers is to be minimised. Again set limits for our country as low and as far into the future as possible.

Q4
Emerging technologies are to be encouraged as best we can. While it is to our country’s benefit to lower our dependence on carbon-based industries let us be quite clear that mankind is in the carbon era; we have been so for the past century and will be for another 50-100 years. Globally the move to electric cars means greater dependency on coal burning electricity generation. Less so in NZ with our globally high production of electricity from renewable resources.

Q5.
Conservatively. However this is one area where NZ can look to our developing technologies and set a higher limit in comparison to competing nations.

Sincerely Yours

Roger Gregg
B Sc, M Sc (Hons)

P.S. I have degrees in geology and chemistry from the University of Canterbury, and have undertaken post graduate studies in geochemistry at the University of Alberta, Canada