

Submission on the Discussion Document

Draft Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040

Are the strategic pillars of the Strategy (Enhancing prosperity for New Zealanders, Demonstrating the sector's value, and Delivering minerals for a clean energy transition) suitable or is there more we need to consider?

Yes, we need to consider the impacts of carbon and methane emissions and other pollution. There should be **two more pillars: 'Reducing greenhouse gas emissions as part of our climate strategy', and 'Protecting our unique environment'**. These pillars were also missing from the Fast Track Bill, which I strongly opposed for that reason. Climate and environmental protection need to be pillars of and key criteria in all policies of primary sector development.

No mining of any kind should happen on any category of public reserve or conservation area. That's what the words 'reserve' and 'conservation' mean to most of us. Mining by private companies on private land should be well regulated and monitored to prevent environmental risk or damage. The onus of proof of safety to the environment should be on the mining company, not the government or local objectors. I really don't care if processing is slow – that's a risk of business.

1. *'Enhancing prosperity for New Zealanders'* can only be considered in relation to climate and environmental protection. There will be no prosperity when our economy is wiped out by storms, floods, fires and rising sea levels taking out our homes and coastal town centres. That will be the outcome of mining and burning more coal.

Crown royalties of \$21m on \$1,030 million is just 2% - !! With profits going offshore to investors and global corporations. That doesn't sound like 'prosperity for New Zealanders' to me!

2. *"Demonstrating the sector's value"* – what? Why is this the government's business as a policy strategy. The mining of minerals is a private sector profit-making business, dominated by overseas ownership. It is not the government's business (as our elected representatives) to promote it, demonstrate its profitability or distort government policies in its favour – as this draft document does.

'Delivering minerals for a clean energy transition' is an oxymoron in this document. Clean energy by definition must not include coal – full stop. There is nothing about mining coal or gold that is clean; coal is the worst kind of dirty energy. And not just when it's burned; the kind of methane leaks that killed 28 at Pike River are an inherent feature of coal seams.

A 'clean transition' means training programmes and assistance for people to move away from 'trickle down' jobs in coal, oil and gas and their supporting infrastructures. We can use their skills in building a circular minerals economy, cleaning up our water delivery and waste systems, building wind turbines, installing solar on building tops, etc. Government including MBIE needs to take a proactive role in this. Jobs for the future, not the 19th century.

If the 'responsible and environmentally sustainably manner' mentioned on p.6 was taken seriously as a criteria, most of the mining anticipated in this document would not be possible.

Are the key actions the right ones to deliver on our strategic pillars, ~~and are they ambitious enough?~~

Your strategy actions don't relate to your pillars.

The 'Strategy at a Glance' graph reveals that the actions are in fact directed at doubling – doubling! – mining and exports of coal and gold. Ambitious? I'd call it irresponsible, or even criminal neglect of our Paris commitments.

Coal is the very dirtiest of fossil fuels and must be kept in the ground. Gold mining involves seriously toxic tailings and is putting our natural areas at risk (as well as literally undermining a township.)

I am shocked that MBIE is planning to mine the beautiful Chatham's for farm phosphate – as we once destroyed Nauru – when we know already how polluted our waterways are from artificial fertilisers. And that MBIE is planning to allow sand mining off the shores of Bay of Plenty and the West Coast, despite the ongoing and so far successful court rulings protecting the sea beds of Taranaki, Pakiri and Mangawhai and widespread public opposition.

At this stage, the other minerals mentioned are under-explored with under-developed techniques – so at this stage it's just hi-techy-sounding smoke and mirrors for the above mining objectives. I have no objection to government agencies doing a stocktake of what's where; that seems useful. But it should be our own government agencies that do it, not private sector prospectors.

Government action towards a circular economic is something I do strongly support. But the actions listed seem very hands-off, think-about-it, may-be-in-3-years. I think MBIE can do better. As our landfills fill up and leech out, we need serious policy action and government funding on this.

Are there opportunities for our minerals sector we haven't considered?

No, clearly our government and various corporations and industry bodies are well aware of many opportunities to sell our precious environment off to the global market.

Are there challenges for our minerals sector we haven't considered?

Yes, you've omitted to consider the challenges of climate change and environmental pollution. The real challenge for MBIE is to help plan a future that is NOT reliant on coal, oil and gas.

A lot of people feel strongly about this – including many of our kids and grandkids. Mines present concrete local opportunities to express opposition to reckless profit-seeking by mining companies, short-term thinking by governments and to the current economic direction that is wrecking our planet.

Linda Hill
Raumati South, 5032

17.7.24