

# The Treasury

## Reserve Bank Act Review Phase 2 Consultation 3 Submission Information Release

February 2021

This document has been proactively released by the Treasury on the Treasury website at

<https://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/information-release/reserve-bank-act-review-phase-2-consultation-3-submission-proactive-release>

### Information Withheld

Some parts of this information release would not be appropriate to release and, if requested, would be withheld under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act).

Where this is the case, the relevant sections of the Act that would apply have been identified.

Where information has been withheld, no public interest has been identified that would outweigh the reasons for withholding it.

Key to sections of the Act under which information has been withheld:

- [23] 9(2)(a) - to protect the privacy of natural persons, including deceased people
- [25] 9(2)(b)(ii) - to protect the commercial position of the person who supplied the information or who is the subject of the information
- [26] 9(2)(ba)(i) - to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied
- [35] 9(2)(g)(ii) - to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through protecting ministers, members of government organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment
- [39] 9(2)(k) - to prevent the disclosure of official information for improper gain or improper advantage

Where information has been withheld, a numbered reference to the applicable section of the Act has been made, as listed above. For example, a [23] appearing where information has been withheld in a release document refers to section 9(2)(a).

### Copyright and Licensing

Cabinet material and advice to Ministers from the Treasury and other public service departments are © **Crown copyright** but are licensed for re-use under **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)** [<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>].

For material created by other parties, copyright is held by them and they must be consulted on the licensing terms that they apply to their material.

### Accessibility

The Treasury can provide an alternate HTML version of this material if requested. Please cite this document's title or PDF file name when you email a request to [information@treasury.govt.nz](mailto:information@treasury.govt.nz).

**Third Submission**

**By**

**THE  
NEW ZEALAND  
INITIATIVE**

**to Treasury and the Reserve Bank of New Zealand**

**on**

**The third consultation round of Phase 2 of the Reserve  
Bank Act Review**

**22 October 2020**

Contact Persons:  
Roger Partridge and Bryce Wilkinson  
Senior Fellows  
The New Zealand Initiative  
PO Box 10147  
Wellington 6143

[35]

## **Introduction and summary**

- 1.1 This submission in response to the third round of consultation on Phase 2 of the review (the review) of the Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act (the Act) is made by The New Zealand Initiative (the Initiative), a Wellington-based think tank supported primarily by chief executives of major New Zealand businesses. In combination, our members provide employment to more than 150,000 people.
- 1.2 The Initiative undertakes research that contributes to the development of sound public policies which help create a competitive, open and dynamic economy and a free, prosperous, fair and cohesive society.
- 1.3 The Initiative's second submission of 16 August, 2019 on the second round of consultation focused on four issues raised in consultation documents 2A and 2B: 1) the Reserve Bank of New Zealand's (RBNZ) high-level financial objective; 2) its governance; 3) prudential regulation tools and powers and 4) enforcement.
- 1.4 That submission strongly opposed dropping the objective of achieving an efficient financial system. Contrary to our submission, the material released for the third round of public consultation indicates that Cabinet has provisionally determined the RBNZ's high-level objective will be "financial stability."
- 1.5 The Initiative considers this decision to be a major error. Without a high level efficiency requirement, an utterly moribund, entirely government-owned financial system would arguably best meet a "financial stability" objective. An utterly moribund, desultory, high cost private sector hog-tied by regulatory red-tape might achieve financial stability. Efficiency is fundamental and must be reinstated in the RBNZ's primary objective.

### **Reasons for making efficiency the over-riding objective**

- 1.6 The prime objective for financial policy should be to ensure New Zealanders have the benefits of an efficient financial system. The reasons were set out in the Initiative's August 2019 submission:
  - Efficiency is a wellbeing objective. Financial stability only contributes to wellbeing to the extent that it enhances efficiency;
  - The Government's "Wellbeing Budget 2019" put wellbeing at the centre of what it intends to achieve. But to downgrade efficiency is to downgrade wellbeing;
  - This will also downgrade both Treasury's Living Standards Framework and its Social Cost-Benefit Primer. In each case the focus is on assessing benefits to those affected relative to costs – i.e. wellbeing;
  - An efficient financial system processes transactions quickly and at least cost. Competitive dynamic innovation will expand the range of products, reduce unit costs and increase risk management options. A moribund "stability over all" system will not;
  - An efficient system would let non-competitive institutions fail, but not at the expense of systemic instability. A "financial stability" objective could easily put too much weight on protecting inefficient individual institutions.

### **Recommendation**

- 1.7 Officials should invite the incoming Government to reconsider this in principle decision.