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**A climate law like the Zero Carbon Act is important because...**

although the argument is that climate change exists (for which I fully agree, believe and support) I believe that in and of itself is irrelevant to the more fundamental need to take care of the environment. For example a sane person wouldn't place their family in a garage while the car engine is still going with all the doors and windows closed because everyone would die and it would be suicidal, because the environment is being made too toxic to survive. Therefore why would the logic be any different just because the environment is bigger and we all won't immediately die? We only have one environment and planet.

**Long-term target**

I support the most ambitious target of reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2030. I also support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels. This target should be reached by reducing our own emissions and not by using international carbon credits. Furthermore we should work towards removing carbon from the atmosphere and hydrocarbons from the ocean, by utilizing existing and creating new technologies and methods to that end. For example planting coral reefs and ocean farming, as well as increasing trees and improving farming and construction methods.

**Climate Commission**

I support the establishment of an independent Climate Commission that is made up of experts and provides advice, but does not make final decisions.

**Adaptation**

I support a plan for adaptation being included in the Zero Carbon Act.

**Climate justice**

A Zero Carbon Act must be just and fair in that it honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi; ensures a just transition for workers and communities; and avoids passing on the costs to future generations.
Further comments

I believe that in order for this to be achievable, it must be made mandatory for all new builds, rented buildings, schools and other public and semi public structures (such as churches which are not heritage buildings) and car park areas to be fitted with solar panels as reasonably practicable and possible. This would not only be future proofing for the event where potentially emission fuel powered vehicles will become obsolete, but also in case of natural disasters such as earthquakes, because there is no guarantee that an earthquake won’t occur in winter and that the infrastructure will remain intact. Furthermore eventually automation and other technologies would potentially be in further demand and in order to remain competitive as a country it is vital that we start thinking about tomorrow today. It would also be worthy to note that New Zealand’s main source of electricity comes from hydroelectric dams. Therefore would not climate change affect our source of electricity production if the damage levels become too low to produce sufficient power? Wouldn’t it therefore make sense to invest in a potential alternative as insurance to that end? If the impact or affect it could have on power companies be a concern, then why not come up with a system similar to crypto currencies, company shares or credit system that can only be used for paying for electricity as opposed to paying people money for power produced from solar or wind energy.

On a different note wouldn’t increasing taxes (such as GST) on products with high carbon footprints (such as imported goods or those who produce high amounts of greenhouse gases such as methane from live stock) and lowering taxes on those with low or negative carbon footprints (such as domestically produced foodstuffs such as fruit, vegetables and honey which are essentially byproducts of plants which remove carbon from the atmosphere). This could also create opportunities for entrepreneurship and encourage investments in these areas if products and byproducts of processes that remove or decrease carbon from the atmosphere are made cheaper and those that increase carbon are made more expensive unless they are offset or controls have been put in place. Perhaps excluding products and byproducts that benefit or from processes that benefit the environment are excluded from export and import taxes, then we may also see further growth and investment in these areas?

My ideas are not perfect and many will disagree, but I hope that by trying and presenting them I may have made a little bit of a difference. I believe the best way for this bill and others like it to be supported are to prove that it not only benefits us and the environment short and long term, but also that it could be profitable, create jobs and improve our capabilities as a country in terms of entrepreneurship and technology and development. I hope that our country will become the best and beat the others and win back our clean and green title.