

---

## Personal Carbon Rationing

Posted by ticktock - 2008/05/26 11:51

---

The Environmental Audit Committee has proposed that personal carbon rationing or quotas is a better system than taxes for cutting carbon emissions:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk\\_politics/7419724.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/7419724.stm)

Is this a better way forward?

I actually question the opposition to it especially regarding the inequalities that are said to be associated with location.

I think that some locations (eg. rural) are in some cases bound to require higher levels of carbon emissions. But then this is the point of trading personal rations, in other locations people would require less and hence could trade their ration with someone that needs more.

If living in a location is 'expensive' carbon wise, then either it shouldn't be lived on or whoever lives there should be able to afford the ration. The alternative is to use lower carbon technology (probably low tech) to live sustainably off the land in such locations (something like the Amish?).

If anything, personal carbon rationing would return the sense of survivability to a location. In the past if someone couldn't survive in a location they moved top somewhere where they could.

Link to report:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmenvaud/565/56502.htm>

=====