

1. Climate Change Contribution Consultation
2. Christopher Hugh Naylor
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]

My responses to the questions raised in the Discussion Document are as follows.

1. I agree that New Zealand's target needs to be ambitious because we are, proportionately, a huge part of the problem. The discussion document tries to minimise our contribution to emissions and maximise our excuses for not doing more. The fact is we are in this position because successive governments have first of all denied the facts of climate change and later accepted it in word but not action, as yet. Price signals need to ensure high emitting businesses, and activity in general, changes or fails. New Zealand has a responsibility to heavily reduce emissions – the polluter must pay and there must be no further subsidisation of greenhouse emissions.
2. The Discussion Document lists difficulties New Zealand has in responding to this necessary commitment to reduce emissions. It's like sitting in your house when it is on fire and listing the unfortunate consequences of leaving! There is no mention of the consequences of not acting in a timely manner (ie yesterday) and the monumental costs associated with that course of action.  
We are a small, smart country, with resources including temperate climate, ability to produce food, water resources, a good education system. If we can't make a major reduction in emissions, no one can.  
We could produce less in the agricultural and forestry sectors but value add to that production so that we profit more from less production and correspondingly lower emissions which will ensure we have a market into the future. (eg sell cheese not milk powder, glu-lam beams not logs. This is really simple and obvious. If we are not responsible global citizens, we will have no customers for our products into the future. Business as usual is NOT an option.
3. Looking at your table of cost per household of reducing emissions, 40% reduction is the minimum. That is a pathetically small cost for something that is imperative to achieve. To make it even fairer for everyone, the government needs to set the rules so that the higher consumers subsidise the lower consumers, and emitter businesses subsidise non-emitter businesses, to force a change in behaviour.

4. If we can't become a low carbon economy after Paris – our “clean, green, 100% pure” image will be seen for what it is – ‘100% bullshit’. No one will buy our stuff at anything but rock bottom prices, our tourism industry will crash. The government needs to emphasise the positive effects of reducing emissions – we can have a better future in a low carbon economy not a reduced one. Our houses must be double-insulated, if that is costly, make them smaller, they are building them too big at the moment, because the costs to the owners and environment are not made clear to people up front. We can make far greater use of solar power, reducing our power bills, put our road building budget into public transport for all, enhance shipping and rail transport over road, plant marginal land in forests and encourage industries that provide employment utilising the timber ourselves instead of shipping raw materials overseas.
  
5. We need to set a target that is no less than our population's share of emissions to stay under 2 degrees warming – that is the absolute minimum target. If technologies come along that help us achieve more than that, they are a bonus. When selling this to the public, the government needs to come clean about the immeasurable costs of not acting. The cost of reducing emissions pale into insignificance when set against these. We are in this mess because of inaction for years of governments, the world over. Enough!



Chris Naylor