



**GREENPEACE**

**Energy Review Update Issue 5.**  
**22<sup>nd</sup> May 2006**

**In this issue:**

- 1. Blair's credibility questioned as he pre-empts review.**
- 2. White Paper confusion.**
- 3. Wicks says that nuclear will be left to the market**
- 4. Get your facts right, David!**
- 5. Backbenchers revolt.**
- 6. Does Gordon really want nukes or is he pretending?**
- 7. Nuclear decision will destroy attempts to build sustainable energy system.**
- 8. Nuclear power is a proven failure.**
- 9. Welsh showdown.**
- 10. Optimism gone mad on nuclear waste.**
- 11. Too many terror suspects; new reactors vulnerable.**
- 12. Energy gap, what energy gap? – WWF report**
- 13. Scottish confusion and Executive indecision.**

**1. Blair's credibility questioned as he pre-empts review.**

*“What is unbelievably depressing about the Conservative government is that they see in the evidence about greenhouse gases not an opportunity to promote environmental concern, but a chance to make the case for nuclear power.” Tony Blair 1986. [1]*

Tony Blair has given his strongest signal yet that he backs the building of a new generation of nuclear power stations. He told the CBI annual dinner that the issue was "back on the agenda with a vengeance". [2] Labour MP, John McDonnell, accused him of pre-empting the energy review and bouncing the government into a decision on behalf of the nuclear industry. [3] Others expressed concern that he had humiliated Energy Minister, Malcolm Wicks, and damaged his own credibility.

Blair said he had received the "first cut" of the energy review, [4] but it appears that no such document actually exists. [5] Friends of the Earth later called on Blair to publish the document and filed a freedom of information request. [6] The speech was *“the clearest public signal that he has made up his mind to commission new nuclear stations”* said *The Times*. *“A smokescreen for a decision that has already been taken,”* said Greenpeace Director, Stephen Tindale. [7] Alan Duncan, the Shadow Trade Secretary, said: *“What on earth is the point of an energy review, when all he ever wanted to do was to say that you will be having nuclear power whether you like it or not?”*

Elliot Morley who was recently sacked as environment minister, at the Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs, disclosed that he had been excluded from key technical details on which the energy review was based. [8] He blamed officials at the Department of Trade and Industry, the department leading the review, but specifically excluded the energy minister, Malcolm Wicks, from his criticism.

"If the review was open, transparent and fair looking at the options on economic grounds across a whole life cost assessment of nuclear stations, the solution may well point to renewables," he said, adding: "We at Defra were not getting the involvement in the energy review at the technical level we should have. It is something we were grappling with. It is something the new secretary of state, David Miliband, should address to make sure there is proper involvement, especially on the energy efficiency side. If you reduce energy demand, you are reducing the need for very expensive investment in generating capacity." He said he had seen no official figures inside Whitehall on the true cost of nuclear power as late as a fortnight ago when he was dismissed.

Jonathan Porritt, chairman of the Sustainable Development Commission, said that the Government's credibility would be damaged if it pre-empted the outcome of the review. [9] He says: there's an overwhelming consensus that the most cost-effective way to reduce both emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and dependence on gas imports is through serious investment in energy efficiency. Sadly, there's a generation of officials in the Department of Trade and Industry for whom this has always been of little interest. [10] Tony Juniper, the director of Friends of the Earth, said: "*The UK could be leading the world in the development of a low- carbon, nuclear-free economy.*"

According to *The Guardian*, Blair is convinced that improved energy efficiency and renewables are not enough to fill the energy gap caused by the phasing out of the current set of nuclear ageing stations. He has been heavily influenced by the government chief scientist, Sir David King, who believes nuclear power could in future provide 40% of electricity supply, double the current figure. [11] Blair's speech will open up divisions inside the cabinet, on the Labour backbenches and provide the first serious test of the nature of David Cameron's green credentials. [12]

Blair's announcement undermined the energy minister, Malcolm Wicks, who only two days earlier dismissed suggestions that the energy review is a cynical exercise to push through new nuclear power. [13] Polly Toynbee called it yet another example of Blair's defiant take-it-or-leave-it, jumping-the-gun policy making. She bumped into Malcolm Wicks and asked him what he thought about being bounced. He gave a wry shrug, rolled his eyes and said: "Well, he's the prime minister ..." [14]

[1] Sunday Times 21st May 2006 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2190285.00.html>

[2] BBC 16th May 2006 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk\\_politics/4987196.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4987196.stm)

[3] Scottish Herald 17th May 2006 <http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/62164.html>

[4] Telegraph 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/05/17/nuke17.xml>

[5] Sunday Herald 21<sup>st</sup> May 2006 <http://www.sundayherald.com/55875>

[6] Guardian 18th May 2006 <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/story/0,,1777276.00.html>

Daily Mail 18<sup>th</sup> May 2006

[http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in\\_article\\_id=386630&in\\_page\\_id=1770](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=386630&in_page_id=1770)

[7] Times 17th May 2006 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-2184192.00.html>

- [8] Guardian 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/nuclear/article/0,,1776514,00.html>
- [9] Telegraph 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/05/17/unuke.xml&sSheet=/news/2006/05/17/ixnews.html>
- [10] Independent on Sunday 21st May 2006  
<http://comment.independent.co.uk/commentators/article549442.ece>
- [11] Blair presses the nuclear button, Guardian 17th May 2006  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianpolitics/story/0,,1776401,00.html>
- [12] Blair decision challenges Cameron's green agenda, Guardian 17th May 2006  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/nuclear/article/0,,1776521,00.html>
- [13] New Statesman Energy Supplement 15th May 2006  
<http://www.newstatesman.com/pdf/energysupp2006.htm>
- [14] Guardian 19th May 2006 <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/columnist/story/0,,1778446,00.html>

## 2. White Paper confusion

The 2003 Energy White Paper promised that before any decision to proceed with new nuclear power stations, a white paper setting out the Government's proposals would be published (para 4.68). But according to *The Guardian* Blair has decided there will not be a separate White Paper after the energy review, suggesting there will be no legislation required and reducing the opportunities for a focused backbench rebellion in the Commons. [1] The Prime Minister's Official Spokesman was later asked to clarify whether there would be a White Paper. He said that the precise nature of the paper had yet to be finalised. It would not include open-ended options, but rather recommendations to be consulted on. How formally that was described, we would have to wait and see. [2]

- [1] Blair presses the nuclear button, Guardian 17th May 2006  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianpolitics/story/0,,1776401,00.html>
- [2] Downing Street 18th May 2006  
<http://www.downingstreetsays.org/archives/002695.html>

## 3. Wicks says that nuclear will be left to the market

Polly Toynbee reports that she asked Malcolm Wicks the vital question. Will nuclear power get any special inducement not offered to other forms of energy generation? Will there be a genuinely level playing field giving every prospective form of clean energy the same chance to prove its viability? That means nuclear power stations would have to pay not only for their waste storage, but the high cost of full insurance: currently they only cover themselves up to a paltry £140m of risk - so a Chernobyl would leave the state picking up a huge bill for compensation and clean-up. Will future nuclear generators be forced to pay into a fund each year enough money to cover all their own decommissioning? The state is now paying a £70bn bill to close existing stations - with the price still rising.

"Yes," was his answer. "Yes, yes and yes. They will pay all their own costs and the Treasury wants to be sure of that." The state paying current nuclear decommissioning costs was, he said, "a disgrace". Not one penny in soft loans or guarantees? "No." What about the price of energy? If the government were to guarantee a fixed minimum price for say, 30 years, it would give the kind of financial security for investors to explore the relative capital and pay-back costs of all kinds of generation. Will the government fix the price? "No, absolutely not".

So it will be left entirely to the market to decide whether to go nuclear? "We will be working on planning regulations generally, so things can move more quickly." Difficulty in getting permissions has indeed been one obstacle to nuclear investment, but if that really is the only extra help nuclear gets, is that enough to make investors go where they have feared to tread until now? "I think it could be, if - and the report's not out yet - the government signalled that it wants nuclear as part of the mix."

Guardian 19th May 2006 <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/columnist/story/0,,1778446,00.html>

#### **4. Get your facts right, David!**

Chief Scientist David King was widely reported saying that nuclear power provides around 20% of our energy. [1] What he should have said, of course, was that it provides around 19% of our electricity - not energy - a term which also includes transport fuel and gas used for heating. Nuclear power actually provides only 8% of our total energy needs [2] or 4% if you allow for energy losses at the nuclear power station. [3]

[1] Guardian 29th May 2006

<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/story/0,,1785144,00.html>

[2] The role of nuclear power in a low carbon economy, Sustainable Development Commission, March 2006 <http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications.php?id=344>

[3] Guardian 30th May 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/letters/story/0,,1785777,00.html>

#### **5. Backbenchers revolt**

Joan Ruddock MP writing in *The Times* said Blair is wrong to say we have no alternative but to build new nuclear power stations. His speech seemed designed to alarm, yet the gradual decline of North Sea gas has been known for decades and British multinationals are investing heavily in new infrastructure to ensure imports come from diverse sources. Just a year ago, the Department of Trade and Industry announced a deal with Norway that "could secure up to 20 per cent of the UK's future gas demand". From Russia, we get about 1 per cent of our supply through the European interconnector. [1]

Elliot Morley, who was recently sacked as environment minister, said building new reactors would cost the taxpayer "*very large sums of money*". He says a true comparative analysis would prove the economic case for investment in energy efficiency and renewables. [2]

Morley, Ruddock, and former Environment Minister Michael Meacher, are amongst 25 Labour backbenchers who have signed a commons motion which says the argument for new nuclear build has not been made and calls for recognition of the enormous potential for energy efficiency, greater use of combined heat and power, and rapid investment in the full range of renewable technologies, including microgeneration. [3] Another Labour signatory, Helen Goodman, a member of the Public Accounts Committee, has warned that Britain would face a crippling multi-billion pound bill for clearing up radioactive waste. [4] A similar motion has been put down in the Scottish Parliament by former Environment Minister, Sarah Boyack. [5]

Together, the two motions suggest that Blair is not going to get his way on nuclear power without a fight within the Labour Party. [6]

Meanwhile, Tory political advisor, Peter Franklin, argues that Conservatives must oppose nuclear power. [7]

[1] Times 19th May 2006

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,6-2187270,00.html>

[2] Guardian 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/nuclear/article/0,,1776514,00.html>

[3] EDM 2204 on new nuclear build:

<http://edmi.parliament.uk/EDMi/EDMDetails.aspx?EDMID=30725&SESSION=875>

[4] This is the North East 20th May 2006

[http://www.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/the\\_north\\_east/news/NEWS8.html](http://www.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/the_north_east/news/NEWS8.html)

[5] S2M-4428 Sarah Boyack: The Energy Challenge.

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/businessBulletin/bb-06/bb-05-23f.htm>

[6] Sunday Herald 21st May 2006

<http://www.sundayherald.com/55786>

[http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/former\\_minister.html#more](http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/former_minister.html#more)

[7] Guardian 18th May 2006

[http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/peter\\_franklin/2006/05/conservatives\\_must\\_oppose\\_nucl.html](http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/peter_franklin/2006/05/conservatives_must_oppose_nucl.html)

## 6. Does Gordon really want nukes or is he pretending?

Gordon Brown will throw his weight behind a new generation of nuclear power stations according to *The Independent* and the *Scottish Herald*. Allies of Mr Brown were reported as saying there was "no real difference" between him and the Prime Minister on the issue, and that he is personally convinced a new nuclear programme is the right way forward. [1] *The Guardian*, on the other hand, reported a Cabinet split over cost of nuclear energy following Treasury predictions of "eye-wateringly large" costs. Cabinet sources say the political achilles heel of the nuclear industry is uncertainty over its costs, rather than safety. There is a lack of certainty as to what the DTI means when it insists that there will be no taxpayers' subsidy to encourage the private sector to build the new stations. The sources believe the government will be forced to make guarantees, soft loans, or rig the market in a way that crowds out the case for renewables. [2]

A question mark remains over the affordability of such a large-scale investment programme and whether the private sector will want to shoulder the cost without economic incentives. Ten reactors are expected to cost around £15bn [3]. Nuclear power stations are financially very risky projects, and almost always cost more than initial estimates. They will require either the taxpayer or the consumer to pay according to Tom Burke, former advisor to several Conservative Environment Ministers [4] No country in the world has nuclear power stations that have not in some way been funded by regional or central government, but the Government has already ruled out a taxpayer subsidy. If consumers were forced to pay a 'nuclear tax' on electricity bills, it could amount to £170 a year according to the *Daily Mail*. [5]

All EdF's nuclear stations in France are bankrolled by the state. [6] Having said it could build ten stations without subsidy, EdF is now setting stringent conditions which throw into question the viability of a new nuclear programme. [7] It wants a fast track planning process, and the price of the electricity generated is guaranteed for years to come. [8] French, state-owned, reactor company Areva, also claims reactors

could be built without any government subsidy, [9] as does British Energy, but they say the government must provide greater certainty over planning consent and the carbon trading market. [10] And one of the world's biggest chemical companies, Huntsman, has offered to part-finance a new nuclear power plant in the North-East by signing a 20-year power deal. [11]

What the nuclear companies generally mean when they talk about streamlined planning procedures is that public involvement in the process – including the assessment of the safety of new untested designs – should be curtailed. Placing consideration of the safety of new nuclear power station designs beyond public scrutiny will not work. [12]

[1] Independent, 18th May 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/politics/article485924.ece>

Scottish Herald 18<sup>th</sup> May 2006

<http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/62237.html>

[2] Guardian 18th May 2006

<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/story/0,,1777264,00.html>

[3] FT 18th May 2006

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/8b4042a2-e60a-11da-b309-0000779e2340.html>

[4] Guardian 18th May 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,1777223,00.html>

[5] Daily Mail 18th May 2006

[http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in\\_article\\_id=386704&in\\_page\\_id=1770](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=386704&in_page_id=1770)

[6] Observer 21st May 2006

<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/business/story/0,,1779585,00.html>

[7] Observer 21st May 2006

<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/business/story/0,,1779577,00.html>

[8] Channel 4 News 12th April 2006 <http://www.channel4.com/news/special-reports/special-reports-storypage.jsp?id=2164>

[9] Guardian 17th May 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianpolitics/story/0,,1776401,00.html>

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/nuclear/article/0,,1776411,00.html>

Independent 15th May 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/business/news/article484463.ece>

[10] Scotsman 17th May 2006

<http://thescotsman.scotsman.com/business.cfm?id=733262006>

[11] Northern Echo 8th May 2006

[12] See Energy Review Update No.3

<http://www.no2nuclearpower.org.uk/reports/ERnewsletterNo3-interim.pdf>

## **7. Nuclear decision will destroy attempts to build sustainable energy system**

The prime minister's decision to support new nuclear power plants shows appalling judgment, according to Catherine Mitchell – a member of the last energy review team. The level of financial and institutional resources needed to enable a new nuclear power programme will, without doubt, undermine investment in renewable energy technologies and efforts to reduce demand. Worse than that, just deciding to put such support measures in place will destroy attempts to build a sustainable energy system. Energy security will get worse because more gas will be needed in the short term before the nuclear plants are constructed; efforts to reduce fuel poverty will be hampered as demand reduction is undermined and electricity costs rise to subsidise the industry; and UK business will take a hit as we are locked out of the rapidly



expanding global markets for renewable energy, which are far greater than the nuclear energy market. [1]

Ken Livingstone also said support for a new generation of nuclear power stations would be the great misjudgement of our generation. It would be an expensive and dangerous mistake to go back down the nuclear road, and one that will not even solve the stated problem of climate change. Two-thirds of the energy inputted into our centralised power stations, including nuclear, is wasted in the form of heat energy emitted as steam through the huge cooling towers that dot the countryside, and in the process of transmitting energy from rural power stations to the towns and cities where it is largely needed. The answer is to use "decentralised" energy systems which would slash energy losses to just 10 or 15 per cent. [2] The Environment Agency has also warned that building more nuclear power stations could "drain resources" from developing renewable energy and other green forms of fuel. [3]

Charles Clover, environment editor of *The Telegraph* says it is difficult to avoid the growing suspicion that we are both being distracted from the Government's difficulties and sold a half-baked strategy that will not solve the problems it is meant to. Mr Blair needs a few "big ideas" to convince people that his Government is decisive and in control. The problem with this one is that it actually isn't big enough. [4]

[1] FT 19th May 2006

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/149ee7f6-e6d3-11da-a36e-0000779e2340.html>

[2] Independent 19th May 2006

<http://comment.independent.co.uk/commentators/article546639.ece>

[3] Independent on Sunday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/politics/article549529.ece>

[4] Telegraph 18th May 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2006/05/18/do1802.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2006/05/18/ixop.html>

## **8. Nuclear power is a proven failure.**

A new pathology is spreading. Sufferers start by expressing concern over climate change or energy security and end by inexplicably claiming that nuclear power is the solution. But they are all victims of "nuclear amnesia", warns Walt Patterson. *"If we make the same mistakes all over again, let us at least be sure that our children know who to blame,"* he says. *"Let us call the first one the Tony Blair nuclear plant."* [1]

Walt Patterson, associate fellow in the energy, environment and development programme at Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs), says the UK has never built a nuclear power station on schedule or within budget, or one that worked according to its original specifications. Our miserable buildings are the single biggest drain on fuel supplies, and the biggest source of carbon dioxide emissions. The UK's building standards are a disgrace, and have been for decades. Anyone who wants to know how we could do better need only read the report, 40% House, published last year by the Environmental Change Institute (ECI) at the University of Oxford. It demonstrated comprehensively how "the UK residential sector can deliver a 60% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050, in line with the targets outlined in UK government's 2003 energy white paper."

[1] <http://www.waltpatterson.org/nucamnesia.pdf>

[2] Guardian 17th May 2006

<http://society.guardian.co.uk/societyguardian/story/0,,1775975,00.html>

## 9. Welsh showdown

Blair's CBI speech has set the scene for a nuclear showdown with Wales. The Assembly Government and Welsh Secretary Peter Hain have both taken a firm anti-nuclear stance. [1] Speculation has inevitably mounted that Wales' two existing nuclear sites - Wylfa on Anglesey and Trawsfynydd, Gwynedd - would be prime sites for new reactors. [2]

[1] Western Mail 17th May 2006

[http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/newspolitics/tm\\_objectid=17088806%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name\\_page.html](http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/newspolitics/tm_objectid=17088806%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name_page.html)

Western Mail 18th May 2006

[http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/newspolitics/tm\\_objectid=17096287%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name\\_page.html](http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/newspolitics/tm_objectid=17096287%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name_page.html)

[2] Wales on Sunday 21st May 2006

[http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/columnists/tm\\_objectid=17110376%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name\\_page.html](http://icwales.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/columnists/tm_objectid=17110376%26method=full%26siteid=50082-name_page.html)

## 10. 'Optimism gone mad' on nuclear waste

Blair has said new reactors cannot be built until there is a plan for disposing of radioactive waste. "*Some advocates of nuclear power will doubtless argue that [the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management] CoRWM has now provided that plan*", says an editorial in *New Scientist* magazine. "*This is optimism gone mad. Deciding to put waste down a hole, with no idea what form the repository should take or where it should be, is no more of a plan than has existed for the past 30 years.*" [1]

The magazine says Blair, cannot go ahead with a new nuclear power programme claiming that draft recommendations from CoRWM provide a solution to the problem of what to do with nuclear waste. CoRWM has said that disposal deep underground is the "best available" long-term solution for the waste, but has not expressed any preference for the type of geology in which a repository should be built. Nor has the committee been able to say whether the waste should be retrievable or not.

The Opportunity to Comment on CoRWM's Draft Recommendations closes on 26<sup>th</sup> May. [2]

Meanwhile, documents obtained by Greenpeace under the Freedom of Information Act reveal that Nirex, the government's nuclear waste agency, had secret plans to launch a covert campaign to promote the burying of radioactive waste and open the door to new nuclear power stations. [3]

[1] *New Scientist* 6<sup>th</sup> May 2006

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg19025503.000.html>

Rob Edwards' website 9th May 2006

[http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/optimism\\_gone\\_m.html](http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/optimism_gone_m.html)

[2] <http://www.corwm.org.uk/content-898>

[3] *Sunday Herald* 14th May 2006

[http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/from\\_sunday\\_her.html](http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/from_sunday_her.html)



See also Spinwatch:

<http://www.spinwatch.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2674>

Spinwatch 14th May 2006

<http://www.spinwatch.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2673>

See also "Nuclear Waste Politics" by Rob Edwards, Open Democracy 18<sup>th</sup> May 2006

[http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-institutions\\_government/nuclear\\_waste\\_3559.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-institutions_government/nuclear_waste_3559.jsp)

## 11. Too many terror suspects; new reactors vulnerable

THERE are now so many terror suspects in Britain that the police and security services are unable to monitor them all. Anti-terrorism police and MI5 have identified as many as 900 people whom they suspect could be linked to potential terrorist plots - a dramatic increase on a previously reported estimate of 400. [1]

The European pressurised water reactor (EPR) is not designed to withstand a 9/11-style aircraft attack by terrorists, a leaked report has revealed. It is capable of resisting an accidental crash by a five-tonne military fighter, but claims that it will also withstand the impact of a 250-tonne commercial airliner flown deliberately into it are based on extrapolation. This assumption, according to independent nuclear engineer, John Large, is "entirely unjustified". [2]

[1] Scotsman 11th May 2006

<http://news.scotsman.com/topics.cfm?tid=758&id=702822006>

[2] New Scientist 18th May 2006

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn9191-europes-new-nuclear-reactors-will-not-be-911proof.html>

Links to the leaked EdF document (in French) and John Large's commentary

[http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/europes\\_new\\_nuc.html](http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/europes_new_nuc.html)

Greenpeace Press Release 19<sup>th</sup> May 2006

<http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/climate/climate.cfm?CFID=4849953&CFTOKEN=88171006&UCIDParam=20060519182454>

## 12. Energy gap, what energy gap?

Environment group, WWF-UK, says the energy gap is nothing more than a myth created to justify building a new generation of nuclear power stations. A report commissioned by WWF from the firm ILEX Energy Consulting concludes that the UK can meet its future energy needs and reduce carbon dioxide emissions without the help of nuclear power. ILEX looked at three scenarios for carbon dioxide emissions and fuel mix for the UK power sector for 2010, 2016, 2020 and 2025. The report finds that some tweaks of energy policy would allow the UK to cut CO2 emissions by 40 per cent from 1990 levels by 2010, and maintain them at this level until 2025. That's despite almost all nuclear power stations being closed during this time. Increased use of renewable energy coupled with reductions in energy waste would allow emissions to fall by 43-55 per cent by 2025, the report says. In contrast, under business as usual emissions would fall by just 18 per cent.

WWF Press Release 9th May 2006

[http://www.wwf.org.uk/news/n\\_0000002587.asp](http://www.wwf.org.uk/news/n_0000002587.asp)

Report: The Balance of Power

[http://www.wwf.org.uk/filelibrary/pdf/ilex\\_report.pdf](http://www.wwf.org.uk/filelibrary/pdf/ilex_report.pdf)

and <http://www.wwf.org.uk/climatechangecampaign/publications.asp>

### 13. Scottish confusion and Executive indecision

Any decisions on new nuclear power plants will now have to be left until after next year's Scottish Parliament election says Liberal Democrat Environment Minister, Ross Finnie. By the time CoRWM has reported its final conclusions, it will be too late for this administration to act. [1]

*The Scotsman* reported that Labour's manifesto for the elections will pave the way for a new generation of nuclear power stations. [2] In fact the battle within the party is far from over. The manifesto won't be agreed until the party conference in November.

The Scottish Executive has yet to submit anything to the Energy Review. Its submission is still being "finalised" and will be submitted before the end of May, then published. After Blair's speech to the CBI it rather looks like crunch decisions are being taken without any formal input from Scotland. [3] However, this could all be academic. If *Scotland on Sunday* is right, new nuclear power stations have been all but ruled out, because the cost of transporting electricity south is too high. [4]

[1] Scottish Herald 15th May 2006 <http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/61992.html>

[2] Scotsman 18th May 2006 <http://news.scotsman.com/politics.cfm?id=738342006>

[3] Sunday Herald 21st May 2006 <http://www.sundayherald.com/55876>

[http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/executive\\_indec.html](http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/executive_indec.html)

[4] Scotland on Sunday 21st May 2006

<http://scotlandonsunday.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=753942006>