

## Climate Change Bill: Forestry Proposals.

I am writing in response to the consultation proposals arising from the Climate Change Bill. I reply in series to the fact specific questions asked and under reply to 4 make some general comments not specifically covered in the questions asked.

① I do not see the need for the Forestry Commission to enter into any joint ventures to achieve any required result when any change required can be carried through by the Forestry Commission itself given any necessary change in the economic guidelines given it by the Government.

② I do not see the need for the involvement of any third parties that any desired result can be achieved by any necessary change in the economic guidelines as in ① above.

③ The introduction of any not-for-profit trust is an unnecessary complication with increased bureaucratic problems which are more likely to cause extra administrative expenses than any increase in efficiency.

④ I am totally opposed to the proposals that up to 25% of Forestry Land should be leased out on terms which are tantamount to the outright sale of public assets to private interests. The proposal that the proceeds from the sale of such leases can be used to finance the expansion of further forestry development is completely misguided when the necessary expansion can be carried through by the Forestry Commission itself given any necessary increase in its financial support and be done on a cost-effective basis.

The overriding necessity is to increase the amount of land used for forestry given the beneficial effect of forestry in the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. I have for some years now been supporting the

works done by the Woodland Trust in the re-creation and expansion of ancient woodlands; such work has many beneficial results but in relation to any reduction in CO2 emissions is marginal in relation to the increase in forestry cover which could be achieved by the Forestry Commission given the necessary financial support and political decisions by the Government.

One relevant cost consideration is the proposal for a substantial increase in the generation of electricity by windfarms; such an increase would be heavily subsidised as without such subsidies the relevant cost/efficiency considerations would render the generation of electricity by this method completely uneconomic. In my opinion decisions about future electricity generation cannot be properly made if the possibility of nuclear generation is excluded from consideration; nuclear power stations can now be made on an improved cost and safety basis and are operational and not dependent on intermittent wind power.

I shall be glad to amplify any points arising from the above comments.

Sincerely

(H.O. McBEATH)