

19 June 2007

STATEMENT BY COUNTY COUNCILLOR RICHARD HALL IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION REGARDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY

1. Keith Banham, a Professor of Physics, from Imperial College, London was quoted as saying in the Sunday Herald *"that nuclear new build would be too little, too late, too expensive and too dangerous. Every man, woman and child in the UK is committed to paying over £30 per head per year, for over thirty years to clear up the waste from existing reactors. No industry with a record like that should be allowed a second chance."* Banham also went on to point out that it takes at least ten years to build a nuclear reactor. *"We need to act now to stop global warming"* he said, *"Germany already has more wind power capacity than all the UK wind and nuclear reactors together and in five years would have installed as much solar energy."*

2. Tim Jackson, a Professor at the Centre of Environmental Strategy at the University of Surrey, said this is the wrong time for Tony Blair to be issuing an invitation to nuclear lobby. He added *"the Prime Minister should be strengthening this government's weak willed commitment to energy efficiency demand reduction and renewable energy – not mortgaging the future for countless generations to hazards of nuclear power"*.

3. In a joint letter from Scientists for Global Responsibility Stuart Parkinson said *"many are sceptical of nuclear energy and believe measures such as controlling energy demand, improving energy efficiency and expanding renewable energy are superior options"*. Parkinson attacked the governments record on energy efficiency and renewable as peace meal and half hearted. He pointed out the cost of clearing up the legacy of the past sixty years of nuclear power was upwards of over £100 billion.

4. In a policy paper published by the government in 2005 Uranium Supplies are Finite. Estimates vary as to how long existing economic extraction of uranium may last, but figures are between forty to eighty years at current rates of use have been quoted and recognised by the government.

5. If a new generation of nuclear plants were commissioned in the next few years it would be unlikely they would be on stream until 2025. If the expected life time of a nuclear power plant is twenty to forty years it is entirely possible that within a lifetime of this new generation a reduction in uranium reserves will impact significantly on the economics of nuclear power generation.

6. In this discussion paper it also makes a point *"it may well therefore be cheaper and easier to make the necessary savings in CO² through well targeted energy efficiency policies in these sectors before building a new raft of nuclear capacity"*.

7. A recent paper from North Yorkshire County Council pointed out that approximately 30% of CO² emissions from the County are generated by household appliances, if we could reduce these emissions by 15%, ie. Half, we could easily meet the Koto agreement on CO² emissions. That could be done by conservation and insulation of people's homes in a manner which my motion suggests.