



GREENPEACE

Energy Review Update Issue 6. **16th June 2006**

- 1. Tories say nuclear is too conservative**
- 2. Subsidy or no subsidy – that is the question**
- 3. DE takes nearly a quarter of energy market**
- 4. Fast track to undemocratic decision-making**
- 5. Deep dump contaminates the future**
- 6. Nuclear sleaze**
- 7. Governments expects local authorities to put in place pro-renewables planning policies**
- 8. Competition threat to safety**
- 9. Scottish elections go nuclear**
- 10. EDF has nothing to celebrate as Champagne is contaminated**
- 11. Sellafield plutonium fuel plant – when in a hole stop digging**
- 12. Accidents will happen – 30 per year involving nuclear waste**
- 13. High-level waste shipments from Sellafield to Japan to start**
- 14. News shorts**

1. Tories say nuclear is too conservative

The Conservative Party has taken a significant step away from its traditional support for nuclear power by rejecting key financial demands from the industry. The Party's stance could stymie government plans for a new generation of reactors, because the industry wants cross-party consensus before it undertakes a programme that could take decades to complete. [1]

The Financial Times reports that Conservatives will back new nuclear power stations provided they can be shown to be cost-effective. An anti-nuclear stance from the Tories would appal many of the Party's business backers and most of their backbench MPs. [2] And a survey of grassroots Tories also suggests that a policy of opposition to nuclear power would be unpopular. [3] But senior Tory MPs are making it clear that they believe Blair's pro-nuclear stance is simply too unambitious

Shadow Chancellor, George Osborne, says it is meaningless for people to support or oppose new reactors. "*Surely the test is whether nuclear can pay for itself and do we have security of supply*". He suggested the right approach was to establish a framework in which Government sets the tests of affordability and security and then leaves it to industry to make its own investment decisions.

Other senior Tory MPs say although Blair's announcement sounded like a dramatic, brave decision - sticking two fingers up to the anti-nuclear lobby in his party - in reality it was not anywhere near radical enough. [4] Support for nuclear is narrow and unambitious, ignoring new technology. Their big idea, which the Tories plan to unveil in six months, is wide-scale

"decentralisation". [5]

Peter Ainsworth, the shadow environment secretary, and Greg Barker, the Tory environment spokesman, say decentralised energy (DE), generated on a smaller local scale, closer to where it is consumed may offer the best way of using the market to stimulate the necessary research, development and innovation required to unlock and harness the potential of renewable energy technologies. If successfully implemented, DE could offer a truly substantial reduction in UK CO2 emissions. This model also appears to offer enhanced energy security - less susceptibility to power failure cascades, terrorist attack or energy dependence on other states.

In contrast Blair's proposals would in fact, saddle the country with an ill thought-out, "back of the envelope" policy, largely uncostered, which will have only a tiny effect on global warming? Leading Tories, still coming to terms with the "vote blue, go green" environmental stance that Mr Cameron and Mr Goldsmith have forced on them, are convinced that the Prime Minister has got it badly wrong.

Alan Duncan, the shadow industry secretary, is conducting the party's own energy review, which will be published soon after the government's energy review next month. The Tories are set to oppose giving a guaranteed price on the grid for nuclear-generated electricity, or a fixed quota for this power, two of the demands most vociferously advanced by the nuclear industry. By refusing to offer any subsidy or guarantees, the Tories will leave the industry struggling to convince investors that it has secured the long-term regulatory framework to make the huge necessary capital investment. [1] Duncan said Blair had "totally pre-empted" his own energy review. He is clearly making a hasty dash for nuclear power in order to define his legacy before he leaves office. However, he still hasn't given any indication of how he will get the investment required. And he has not yet agreed policy for dealing with nuclear waste." [6]

[1] Guardian, 9th June 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianpolitics/story/0,,1793465,00.html>

BBC 9th June 2006

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/5063206.stm

[2] FT 3rd June 2006

<https://registration.ft.com/registration/barrier?referer=&location=http%3A//news.ft.com/cms/s/16126efc-f29d-11da-b78e-0000779e2340.html>

[3] Guardian 6th June 2006

<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/libdems/story/0,,1791160,00.html>

[4] Telegraph 21st May 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/05/21/nuke121.xml&sSheet=/news/2006/05/21/ixuknews.html>

[5] 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>

[6] Daily Mirror 10th June 2006

http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/tm_objectid=17208139%26method=full%26siteid=94762%26headline=my%2dnuke%2duk%2d-name_page.html

2. Subsidy or no subsidy - that is the question.

Tony Blair will rule out financial incentives to rig the market in favour of new nuclear reactors, according to *The Financial Times*. Whitehall officials have told the newspaper that an internal economic analysis suggests nuclear power will be a more cost-effective way of generating electricity than both gas and coal. Soaring gas prices and the rising cost of tradeable carbon permits will make the construction, operation and decommissioning of nuclear plants commercially attractive. But the licensing and planning regime will be streamlined to cut investment costs and accelerate building. Blair hopes a "green light" from

the Energy Review will kick-start the building of up to 10 plants on existing sites. [1] He has signalled his determination to see a new generation of nuclear power stations by signing a formal agreement that could lead to French companies building them. [2]

Mr Blair and his officials appear to be victims of the "nuclear amnesia" that Walt Patterson of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, has warned about. "*If we make the same mistakes all over again, let us at least be sure that our children know who to blame,*" Patterson says. "*Let us call the first one the Tony Blair nuclear plant.*" [3]

Although new reactors might be financed, built and operated by private consortia of energy companies, backed by banks, these companies are demanding that the government addresses the risks they face: lengthy planning inquiries, the possibility that electricity price could slump, forcing nuclear operators into insolvency (as happened to British Energy), and escalating decommissioning costs. The Nuclear Industry Association has demanded that the Energy Review deliver a streamlined planning system, a mechanism to support the price of nuclear power by forcing all suppliers to buy it at above a certain price, and a cap to decommissioning liabilities. [4]

Robert Davies, the UK representative of French nuclear company Areva, claims nuclear is cheaper than gas and needs no taxpayers' subsidy. [5] Eon's UK Chief Executive, Paul Golby, has made similar claims to *The Sunday Times* (21st May 2006) and has been challenged by SERA activist, David Lowry, to justify this. Lowry says: nuclear operators have limited liability in the case of an accident; the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate currently covers the costs of the pre-construction safety analysis; the Office of Civil Nuclear Security pays towards security of nuclear facilities and materials in transit; the Government pays the costs of the UK's membership of the EU nuclear agency, Euratom; and the International Atomic Energy Agency — both of which do promotional and safety work for nuclear power; the Government is paying for research into so-called "Generation 4" reactor designs; finally Lowry says we should make clear that private investors should pay for the full cost of management (or eventual "disposal") of the new radioactive waste produced — including the eventual decommissioning of defunct reactors and associated infrastructures. [6]

The Treasury is known to have serious misgivings about a new nuclear building programme because the cost of constructing and decommissioning stations constantly rises. Other cabinet opponents - thought to include Margaret Beckett, Peter Hain and Hilary Benn - have deep reservations about nuclear power, and are determined to extract concessions if a pro-nuclear decision is taken. 'We will argue that if there is some kind of preferential treatment for nuclear, there must be a level playing field with other carbon-free technologies,' said one.

Despite this, Gordon Brown has been making noises supportive of new nuclear build. On 5th June he told the CBI the country needed "*a balanced policy which takes account of guaranteed supply, including nuclear.*" [7] Writing in *The Times*, the Chancellor said: "*..in Britain over the coming weeks and months we will demonstrate our enhanced flexibility with further reforms in planning, skills and labour markets, and in energy policy, including new nuclear...*" [8] *The Times* interpreted this as a commitment to building a new generation of nuclear power stations. [9]

[1] FT, 12th June 2006

http://news.ft.com/cms/s/ff52a082-f987-11da-8ced-0000779e2340_i_rssPage=247a7efa-c8dc-11d7-81c6-0820abe49a01.html

Interactive Investor 12th June 2006

<http://www.iii.co.uk/news/?type=afxnews&articleid=5672489&subject=economic&action=article>

[2] Telegraph, 10th June 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/06/10/nuke10.xml>

Guardian, 10th June 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianpolitics/story/0,,1794417,00.html>

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

[4] Observer 4th June 2006

<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/business/story/0,,1789671,00.html>

[5] Guardian 23rd May 2006

<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/green/comment/0,,1781116,00.html>

[6] Letter from David Lowry, Sunday Times 28th May 2006,

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2095-2199866.html>

[7] Financial Times, 6th June 2006

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/cb423944-f4f8-11da-86f6-0000779e2340.html>

[8] Times 10th June 2006

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,13130-2218726_1,00.html

[9] Times 10th June 2006

<http://business.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,8210-2219251,00.html>

Oral evidence by Paul Golbey, Vincent de Rivaz, and others to the House of Commons Trade and Industry Committee, 6 June 2006, now available:-

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmtrdind/uc1122-iii/uc112202.htm>

3. DE takes nearly a quarter of energy market

According to World Alliance for Decentralised Energy's (WADE) latest annual DE market assessment, the

World Survey of Decentralized Energy – 2006, published on 25 May,

24% of electricity output from newly installed power generation plants in 2005 was derived from decentralized energy systems. This share is up from 13% in 2002.

The pioneering research (based on DE industry interviews, market information provided by WADE members and other publicly available sources) indicates a clear momentum in many international markets towards greater use of DE. DE's growing competitive position is based on a rapidly emerging recognition of the economic benefits of generation at the point of demand which results in reduced need for high cost investment in transmission and distribution networks. Other drivers include the environmental benefits, fuel savings and increased security of electricity supply.

Countries such as Denmark, the Netherlands and Finland, still lead the way with the DE share of generation at 40-50%.

4. Fast track to undemocratic decision-making

An overhaul of the planning system will be at the heart of a programme to boost competitiveness, Gordon Brown has indicated. Seeking to overcome long-standing business concerns over the difficulty of developing industrial sites, Mr Brown said the Treasury would announce a review of the planning system at the end of this month, followed by new legislation in the pre-Budget report this autumn. He said: "*We must make our system quicker, more flexible and more responsive.*" Kate Barker, a former member of the Bank of England's monetary policy committee, is this month expected to publish an interim report on planning reform, which Treasury officials say will be an objective analysis of the implications for business and the environment. [1]

"Fast tracking" plans for new nuclear plants would sideline community views, according to the Stop Hinkley campaign group. "It is vital that the planning and licensing stages are open and transparent" it says. Curtailing the planning process would make it a "charade" and "fundamentally undemocratic". [2]

The nuclear industry in Britain may be looking wistfully across the Channel to France where it can take as little as four months to receive permission to build. EDF is currently planning to build France's first European Pressurised Water Reactor (EPR) at Flamanville-3. The French

Government has scheduled the obligatory public inquiry for between June 15 and July 31, partly in the summer vacation, usually considered off-limits for such public consultations. This probably reflects a desire to get the project under way well before elections next spring. EdF wants to start construction next year so that the plant can be operational by 2012.

The inquiry will be held in 19 municipalities within 10 kilometers (about 6.2 miles) of the Flamanville site, where EDF already operates two reactors. A substantive document of about 1,000 pages will go to these local communities, but will be chained to a desk and kept under heavy security. People wanting to make submissions can only read the document (in French) in the room where it is kept and make comments there and then. A three-man inquiry panel are scheduled to produce a report in the fall, reflecting the public's written comments and results of public hearings that may be held. The local prefect will transmit his decision, based on the public inquiry results and other local consultations, to the national government in October. [3] Is this what EdF and other nuclear companies mean when they call for "fast track" public inquiries?

Tim Pugh, of Commercial lawyers, Berwin Leighton Paisner, told *The Times* "The UK has a history of long inquiries but, in a democratic society, trying to ramrod difficult decisions is counter-productive. Inquiries and consultations are essential to public acceptance. Further system changes will not help. The answer lies in decisive government, eradicating avoidable delay and imaginative use of collaborative procedures." [4]

[1] Financial Times, 6th June 2006

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/cb423944-f4f8-11da-86f6-0000779e2340.html>

[2] Western Daily Press 22nd May 2006

<http://www.westpress.co.uk/displayNode.jsp?nodeId=146238&command=displayContent&sourceNode=146064&contentPK=14506459&folderPk=69655>

<http://www.westpress.co.uk/displayNode.jsp?nodeId=146238&command=displayContent&sourceNode=146064&contentPK=14506417&folderPk=69655>

[3] Nucleonics Week, Vol.47, No.22, 1st June, 2006

[4] Times 30th May 2006

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,27969-2199445.html>

5. Deep dump contaminates the future

A leaking nuclear waste dump could expose future generations to radiation levels up to 1,000 times higher than safety targets, according to the government's radioactive waste agency, Nirex. Documents obtained by *The Sunday Herald* reveal that people hundreds of thousands of years in the future face an increased risk of cancer because their drinking water could be contaminated by radioactive waste buried today.

Sunday Herald 11th June 2006

http://www.robedwards.com/2006/06/high_radiation_.html

6. Nuclear sleaze

Labour has received thousands of pounds in donations from energy companies and lobbying firms linked to the nuclear industry. The cash donations give the pro-nuclear lobby access to decision makers, campaigners for the environment warned. Details published by the Electoral Commission showed that the money from nuclear interests flooded in as the government prepared for a review of long-term energy needs. [1]

The MP whose constituency includes the Sellafield nuclear plant was taken on a 'freebie' trip to America worth almost £7,000 by one of the US's largest nuclear companies, which is competing to win a multi-million pound contract to clean up the Cumbria site. Jamie Reed,

Labour MP for Copeland, was flown business class by Fluor on a six-day trip to see its operations in Hanford, Washington State, in May.

The new Environment Secretary, David Miliband, whose arrival at DEFRA prompted *The Guardian* to ask whether the changes are really designed to smooth the way for nuclear power, [3] was almost immediately embroiled in a sleaze row over his links to a nuclear industry lobbyist - Alan Donnelly - who chairs the minister's local constituency party. Donnelly, whose lobbying firm represents the US multinational Fluor, one of the world's biggest nuclear companies, helped to pay for the refurbishment of Miliband's constituency party headquarters in Newcastle. [4]

[1] Independent 27th May 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/politics/article620219.ece>

[2] Telegraph 27th May 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/money/main.jhtml?xml=/money/2006/05/27/cnucl27.xml>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/money/main.jhtml?xml=/money/2006/05/27/cnucl27.xml&menuId=242&sSheet=/money/2006/05/27/ixcoms.html>

[3] Guardian 10th May 2006

<http://society.guardian.co.uk/societyguardian/story/0,,1770905,00.html>

[4] Sunday Times, 14th May 2006

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2180107,00.html>

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2179570,00.html>

7. Governments expects local authorities to put in place pro-renewables planning policies

Yvette Cooper MP, Minister for Housing and Planning announced a major step forward for planning policy and micro renewables at the REA conference. The Government clarified the wording of PPS22 planning guidelines on the wider take-up of Merton-type pro-renewables planning policies. The Government now "expects all authorities" to put in place such policies and is writing to all Chief Planning Officers urging them to do so. The speech referred to the pioneering efforts of Merton and Croydon councils and emphasised that "it is essential that all planning authorities follow this example."

8. Competition threat to safety

Safety standards will be compromised during Britain's £70 billion programme to clean up the radioactive mess left by the nuclear industry, trade unionists have warned. Scientists and engineers from within the industry have said that short-term competitive contracts awarded by the government's Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) would undermine safety procedures and put the public at risk. The NDA is inviting multinational companies to bid for three-year contracts to clean up old nuclear complexes like Dounreay in Caithness and Sellafield in Cumbria.

Sunday Herald 28th May 2006

<http://www.sundayherald.com/55982>

With links: http://www.robedwards.info/2006/05/short_cleanup_c.html

TUC Hazards Magazine 22nd May 2006

http://www.tuc.org.uk/h_and_s/tuc-11900-f0.cfm#tuc-11900-3

9. Scottish elections go nuclear

Nicol Stephen, the Deputy First Minister and leader of the Scottish Liberal Democrats, has signalled his determination to challenge his Labour coalition partners over nuclear power and make it the defining issue of next year's election campaign, but the Greens are not convinced he will not sell-out.

Stephen told BBC Scotland's Good Morning Scotland programme he thought “*it would be very unlikely that the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats would have the same manifesto policy*” – even though the Scottish Labour Manifesto won't be decided until November, although *The Scotsman* says the Labour leadership wants to go into the election with a policy of keeping option open. Mr Stephen stressed the Executive's current agreed position, which is to oppose any new nuclear stations until the issue of waste is resolved. [1]

But Robin Harper MSP, the Scottish Greens co-leader, criticised the Lib-Dems for their failure to state whether, following next year's election, they will or will not form part of a government that will build new nuclear power stations. The Greens fear that, despite manifesto commitments, the Lib Dems may offer too many concessions in coalition negotiations. [2]

[1] Scotsman 25th May 2006

<http://news.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=772722006>

[2] Herald 1st June 2006

<http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/63138-print.shtml>

10. EDF has nothing to celebrate as Champagne is contaminated

Radioactive contamination from a closed waste dump in Normandy, France is leaking into groundwater, used by local farmers for their dairy cattle, according to a report published by French laboratory ACRO for Greenpeace. And similar contamination is beginning to appear at a newer dumpsite in the Champagne region.

Contaminated water from the CSM (Centre Stockage de la Manche), low and intermediate-level waste disposal facility migrates from the dumpsite into the underground aquifers used by farmers, where levels of radioactivity are on average 750 Bequerels per litre, over seven times the European safety limit of 100Bq/l.

The dump was used from 1967 to 1994 with about 90% of the waste coming from EDF, which has offered to build new nuclear reactors in the UK. Greenpeace has demanded the removal of foreign waste, illegally dumped in France, and the removal and repackaging of waste from EDF. A former senior engineer at the facility has stated that in addition to tritium, other radionuclides in the dump, including plutonium, will leak out and given the state of the waste in the dump, it should now be removed. [1]

CSM reached its capacity in 1994 and was closed. Since then large volumes of nuclear waste have been disposed of at a new site in eastern France at Soulaire (Centre Stockage l'Aube [CSA]). CSA is in the Champagne region and has already begun to contaminate groundwater - though at far lower levels – only 10 years after its construction - despite having no license to discharge. The Champagne vineyards of France could face a nuclear disaster, according to Greenpeace. [2]

In addition to the low and intermediate level waste dumpsites, the French Government is planning to develop an underground site for high-level waste in eastern France at Bure. The same assurances that were made for CSM on geology and hydrology are being issued about both Soulaire and Bure. [3]

[1] Greenpeace International Press Release 29th May 2006

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/press/releases/illegal-french-nuclear-waste-d>

[2] FT 1st June 2006

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/173fce30-eff7-11da-b80e-0000779e2340.html>

View London 31st May 2006

http://news.viewlondon.co.uk/Radiation_fear_in_Champagne_region_17129617.html

Greenpeace International Press Release 30th May 2006

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/press/releases/radioactive-waste-leaking-into>

[3] Greenpeace International Press Release 23rd May 2006

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/press/releases/greenpeace-report-reveals-fren>

11. Sellafield plutonium fuel plant – when in a hole stop digging

British Nuclear Group has signed its first new MoX (plutonium) fuel order in four years, with German utility EnBW for Neckarwestheim-2 nuclear station. The contract includes a commitment by the utility to convert all the separated plutonium from the fuel it is having reprocessed at THORP into MoX. [1] However, the spent nuclear waste fuel from Neckarwestheim-2 still has to be reprocessed and THORP is still not working, and there is a question-mark over whether it will ever open again. [2]

[1] Platts Nuclear News Flashes 8th May 2006

[2] Nuclear Fuel Vol, 31 No.11 22nd May 2006

12. Accidents will happen – 30 per year involving nuclear waste

There are 30 accidents involving nuclear trains a year in Britain. [1] In May a car collided with a train at a small gated level crossing in Suffolk. The driver, a local, had simply forgotten to check for the once-daily train that makes its way along the narrow rural track. He unbolted the gate, drove straight on to the crossing, and did not see the two-car train bearing down on him until it was too late. The train was on its way to the Sizewell A energy plant in Suffolk. [2] The accident, in which no-one was hurt, has re-ignited the debate over "nuclear trains", which haul up to two tonnes of spent nuclear fuel at a time to the reprocessing plant at Sellafield, often passing through major conurbations such as London, Milton Keynes and Preston on the way. About 200 trains a year pass through the capital alone, carrying radioactive waste within yards of schools, hospitals and millions of homes.

[1] Guardian 31st May 2006

<http://society.guardian.co.uk/societyguardian/story/0,,1785848,00.html>

[2] BBC 23rd May 2006

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/suffolk/5007782.stm>

13. High level waste shipments from Sellafield to Japan to start

British Nuclear Group (BNG) is preparing to return high-level waste (HLW) from reprocessing Japanese spent fuel back to Japan starting in the next financial year, 2007/08. At least 11 shipments are expected, assuming the Japanese are able to change the law to allow them to import slightly more HLW as a substitute for bulkier lower level wastes. Roughly one of the shipments going to Japan would be HLW which was originally British. In return approximately 22 shipments of Japanese Intermediate Level Waste would remain in this country. According to one report this substitution could cut Japan's waste disposal costs to almost a quarter of current estimates.

Nuclear Fuel Magazine Vol.31, No.12 5th June 5

14. News shorts

George Monbiot, writing in the Guardian complains about failure to check builders are complying with the energy efficiency standards required under the building regulations

Guardian 30th May 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,1785712,00.html>

A US Appeals Court has ruled that the potential for acts of terrorism and sabotage must be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for nuclear facilities. It finds that acts of terrorism are not "remote and speculative" as claimed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and must be considered in weighing environmental impacts as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Reuters 2nd June 2006

http://today.reuters.com/investing/financeArticle.aspx?type=bondsNews&storyID=2006-06-02T192033Z_01_N02196675_RTRIDST_0_UTILITIES-NRC-TERRORISM.XML

One-quarter of the electricity output from new power generation facilities globally last year was derived from decentralized energy (DE) systems, almost double the share of 13% in 2002.

Re-focus Weekly 31st May 2006

<http://www.sparksdata.co.uk/refocus/redesign/showdoc.asp?docid=91209048&accnum=1>

Around 40 per cent of the UK has the right geology to 'dump' nuclear waste, according to initial findings by the British Geological Survey (BGS). If confirmed, this figure is much higher than the 30 per cent judged to be suitable 10 years ago, when the building of an underground nuclear waste repository was last considered.

Independent on Sunday 4th June 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/business/news/article624537.ece>

Sir John Harman, Chairman of the Environment Agency (EA) writing in the Energy Supplement 2006 to "Your Environment", the bi-monthly magazine of the EA, asks "Do we need a new generation of nuclear power stations? We are not against nuclear energy, so long as it achieves high standards of safety, security, environmental performance and waste management. But we are concerned that massive investment in one technology could drain resources away from others - including renewable energy and energy efficiency."

Greenpeace has published its response to CORWM's draft recommendations

<http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/corwm-recommendations>

Prof James Lovelock has offered, once again, to store high-level nuclear waste on his land if it would help to revive the fortunes of atomic energy in Britain. This is not a new idea - Lovelock suggested it 6 years ago.

Telegraph 8th June 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/06/08/nuke08.xml>

Guardian 16th September 2000

http://www.guardian.co.uk/saturday_review/story/0,,368955,00.html

Sellafield operators British Nuclear Group pleaded guilty to three charges brought by the Health and Safety Executive on 8th June, following a massive radioactive leak which went undetected at the THORP plant for months. The £1.8bn reprocessing plant is still shut following the incident. The case was adjourned until 7th July.

Guardian 9th June 2006

<http://money.guardian.co.uk/businessnews/story/0,-1793798,00.html>

Telegraph 9th June 2006

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/06/09/nsella09.xml>