Twitter Thread by Christine from Canada ■■■■



Christine from Canada ■■■■
@QueenMom091517

In a ridiculously simplified way, yes!
Taxing people to use resources required to live because they "pollute" is a sick lie!
We cannot allow raw sewage dumps and uncontrolled littering and unnecessary pollution to continue to be a modern convenience b/c it's easier than caring.

> It seems many people, including some journalists, really don\u2019t know that CO2 is used in photosynthesis. This La Presse article for example says that I \u201cclaim\u201d that CO2 is food for plants. As if this were controversial?!! https://t.co/cpXflSuRhq
>
> — Maxime Bernier (@MaximeBernier) October 25, 2018

We need proper incentives that allow people to actually save money on making changes that save energy/reduce emissions/save on residual bills so that they can spend in other areas... investments, businesses, education, vacation here and there.

Having people be able to invest or spend on commodities is what helps improve the economy. The more that hard working people have extra in their pocket, the more they are willing to put back into the whole economy, not forced to pay taxes destined to other countries.

We had incentive programs... BROKEN, INEFFICIENT AND COSTLY rebate and incentive programs. Programs that indebted us more than they were worth. But we learn and try to come up with smaller, more efficient solutions designed to both reduce costs and carbon footprint.

Government needs to be removed from owning any project or shares in projects, especially energy projects or developments.Government already oversees planning and approvals. Can't be amending laws to suit controversial projects or stop good ones because you can't profit from them.

The greener and more environmentally and wallet friendly your project is, the more fiery hoops you seem to have to jump through.

Yeah #CarbonTax but we will disavow and rule against anything that shows Canada how affordable a new net0+ home in a sustainable subdivision is

Compared to buying and owning a conventional new home in a new conventional subdivision.

Yeah, over 25 years, it's not even close when you aren't paying utilities bills and providing a service to the community and neighbouring or local hydro grids. Imagine paying down your

Mortgage at 300+ dollars more a month because you put previous utilities money into your mortgage instead. Own it almost 10 years earlier and for a lot less interest... say starting at 60k in interest saved.

So,short term, you live in a beautiful new modern spot with every

Commodity you could want. You leave q very minimal carbon footprint. Cost the same as s conventional mortgage but funds directed slightly differently. But in 5 to 10 years earlier than conventional, your mortgage is paid off and you save at least 60k on interest, if not more.

That's all assuming you still drive a gas vehicle.
Imagine having costs of infrastructure already in place when you bought your place to accommodate an EV.
The technology in your home was built by a subsidiary company of the one marketing you your car. Incentives worked out

For both home and vehicles.
Because your new community was conceptualized, planned, designed, built, maintained, powered and automated by people with a similar goal:

improving quality of life and income flow/availability while minimizing impact on environment without selling out to big Corp or Gvt, by people for people!

Imagine an affordable Canadian Utopia!

(If only I could figure out how to keep a moderate climate bubble at fair price)

That climate bubble is very attainable in many parts of the world via physics and geothermal systems. Not sure the model can withstand temperatures and swings of -40/+40 for a price that would work for our target market. Bubble means that almost all emitted energy would be

Captured and reused before leaving the "bubble" thus not affecting climate outside the community!

Not smoke and mirrors
....

It's more like hot/cold air and mirror-like building materials (mirrors the energy where it's needed).
Savvy?