

Dear Sir,

I have only recently become aware of this consultation exercise. Despite having submitted responses to a variety of other nuclear and NPS-related consultations this year and given evidence to the NPS Select Inquiry, I was unaware of this one. To me this is typical of what passes for "consultation" by the government. How is one supposed to become aware of these exercises? Why was such an important consultation hidden behind the election? There is an obvious answer - that government don't want people to know, let alone respond.

Once again the industry is trying to change the rules, and some members of the coalition government are back-tracking on the anti-nuclear stance that helped them win votes. It is a pity that there appears to be no-one with any moral integrity left in politics.

Consultation for the previous exercises was flawed, as I showed. I demonstrated that fewer than 1 in 4 residents who would be affected by the green-field development at Braystones in Cumbria had any knowledge of RWE's proposals. Yet the government had assured the Select Inquiry that there had been widespread consultation.

It was said all along, even by the last government, that there would be no subsidy for the nuclear industry. By manipulation this is precisely what is now happening.

The most recent event to be used to try and benefit the nuclear industry is the unfortunate oil spill off the coast of Florida. I note that this is now being used to persuade people of the disadvantages of drilling for oil, and expanded to the use of oil for power. However, bad though the spillage is, a nuclear accident would no even fewer boundaries and many, many more people would be affected by one. Why is so little made of the daily disposal of effluent into the Irish Sea by Sellafield? What of the vast stores of waste kept in decaying tanks on the site? What if a terrorist-flown airplane were to crash into the waste holding ponds? Also, I am aware of several occasions when cooling water pumps have failed to this site - next time the requisite flow may not be restored in time. This will make the BP problem look very small indeed.

It is difficult to understand how anyone can contemplate paying for future waste when there are so many unknowns. To pretend otherwise would be nonsensical. There will only be one beneficiary from such a scheme.

Ostensibly these nuclear generators are private companies. They already receive considerable benefits, despite their private nature. The whole industry should be made to face its costs and then assess whether power generated this way is financially viable. According to most sources it is not viable. We thus have to have this manipulation to tilt the benefits their way in order that vast profits can flow out of the country. It is amazing that private industries - not even from the UK - can be permitted so much benefit for so little in return and without good reason.

Given the ability of the companies to distort evidence, I would suggest that the UK taxpayer will be seriously at risk if any attempt is made to forecast the future price of

waste disposal for generating companies. These people seem so much better at gaining financial benefit than the government are at preventing them taking advantage.

The remaining questions of whether the theoretical framework for such funding is substantive or not are therefore irrelevant. Whatever else, the only winners will be the energy-generating companies and the taxpayer will be the loser. That the sums can be shown to add up is thus of no moment.

The UK population has been lied to over and over again by the nuclear industry; it is neither clean nor green. Nor is its expansion necessary or financially viable. Sadly, it now seems that the faint hope of some honest MPs being elected to a position to prevent the expansion is being eroded by false promises and the huge sums of money involved in the industry.

The framework being put forward in the consultation may well be adequate for its purpose, however, it would be far more honest if the promise of no subsidies at all were to be honoured.

Yours sincerely,

Ian F. Hawkes,