

The Daily Mail reported...

Privacy Policy | Feedback  Follow 22.5M

Sunday, Oct 1st 2023 6AM 15°C  9AM 19°C  5-Day Forecast

MailOnline

News

The drive for Net Zero 'could cost households £6,000 a year' despite Rishi Sunak ditching or delaying green policies, report warns

- Rishi Sunak has already ditched or delayed several green policies
 - It was previously estimated that the price tag for net zero would be £1.3 trillion
 - But Civitas says it may cost up to £4.5 trillion to reach net zero by 2050
- Update: Since publication of this article Civitas have acknowledged errors in their report, where electricity capacity and output were confused. Following correction the report will be re-published.

A row broke out last night over the race to net zero amid claims it could cost every household £6,000 a year.

Despite **Rishi Sunak** ditching or delaying a host of green policies last week, a report by the Civitas think-tank said the government's current eco-drive will cost £4.5trillion by the 2050 deadline.

The **Climate Change** Committee previously estimated the price tag for net zero would be £1.3trillion. But economist Ewen Stewart, who authored the report, accused ministers of underestimating the cost of net-zero policies.

He said Britain was a 'global outlier' in the strength of its emissions targets – despite having already cut harder and faster than almost all other developed nations'.

Civitas also claimed that the committee underestimated the impact of interest rates on borrowing costs, the cost of building new electricity generating capacity, and potential job losses in the automotive industry.

The Daily Mail used a report that isn't just inaccurate or exaggerated, it is wrong by a factor of more than 18000!

What the Daily Mail did not report...

The Daily Mail ran a story about the cost of getting to Net Zero. They quoted hugely exaggerated figures that had been provided by a new report from Civitas. The Daily mail misinformed the public. There were so many errors in the report that the Daily Mail then reported the errors as a follow-up piece - yet used it as an opportunity to publish another misleading headline (overleaf). Are they pushing a narrative to delay a just transition from fossil fuels and increase the harm? **Are you really OK with that?**

*The report suggests that new onshore wind turbines will cost **£1.3 million in capital expenditure per MWh** when, in reality, the cost is only a fraction of that amount, at **£50-70 per MWh!** (For full report of errors see Desmog QR)*

Civitas were not just inaccurate, they were wrong by a factor of more than 18000!

Why did the Daily Mail echo a report that is inaccurate and misleading?

1. Perhaps the newspaper thinks the report's authors, Civitas, are a trusted news source? But Civitas clearly don't do maths! Plus, they are secretive about their funding and linked to the Institute of Economic Affairs, a think-tank that helped crash the economy last year.
2. Maybe the Daily Mail doesn't bother to check it's facts before printing stories.
3. Alternatively, the newspaper's editors got so excited about a 'report' supporting their war on Net Zero that they knew Civitas had the science badly wrong - and published anyway.

Whichever way you look at it, the Daily Mail was left looking reckless, incompetent or sinister. Please follow the QR links to sources of accurate and reliable climate science data.

DESMOG



SCIENCE



JOIN US

