

# A corruption of governance?

---

*How Ministers and Parliament were misled.*

- **This report is about the Government's decision to support new nuclear power stations**
- **It is neither for nor against that decision**
- **It shows that the evidence given to Ministers and Parliament, on which they based that decision, was a false summary of the analysis carried out within Government**
- **This report is about a corruption of Governance**

# Executive Summary

---

**In Chapter 1** we show that, **on the basis of the Government's own evidence**, we do not need any more new nuclear power stations in order to 'keep the lights on' and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 80% by 2050.

**In Chapter 2** we show that, **on the basis of the Government's own evidence**, electricity generated by nuclear power is the not the least expensive of all low-carbon technologies. In everyday terms, the building of new nuclear power stations to provide electricity is likely to mean higher fuel bills.

**In Chapter 3** we try to assess what has gone on. Why the seemingly inexplicable decisions documented in Chapters 1 and 2 (i.e. the decisions in favour of new nuclear power stations that are not needed) were taken by successive Governments.

And let us state at the outset: we are neither blaming, nor questioning the integrity of Ministers, MPs and Parliament as a whole. They acted sincerely on the basis of the evidence that they were shown, and on the basis of that information took their decisions. But the information given to them was false.

**What has gone on is nothing less than a corruption of governance.**

**This corruption of governance can only be rectified if Parliament re-opens this debate, and MPs vote on this issue having seen the correct information.**

## **Box 1: Questions that need to be answered**

1. Why did the previous Government take two decisions – to reverse previous policy and decide that new nuclear power is needed, and then decide that 10 nuclear power stations are needed – without assessing the long term demand for electricity?
2. Why did the original EN-1 and EN-6 documents, prepared for the previous Government, claim that Redpoint's analysis showed the need for medium term capacity to increase, when it did nothing of the sort?
3. Why didn't the previous Government carry out an assessment of the full potential of energy efficiency (even though they declared it was the most cost-effective way of meeting energy policy objectives), before deciding how much electricity we needed to generate?
4. Why is the current Government ignoring the evidence in its own Pathways to 2050 work, and insisting that nuclear power is necessary to keep the lights on and reduce CO<sub>2</sub>, when the analysis shows the opposite?
5. Why have numerous Government documents misrepresented evidence from Government analysis by saying that electricity demand may double, when in fact the analysis and the modelling shows something different?
6. Why has the EN-1 document, prepared for this Government, ignored the results of their modelling, the National Grid modelling, and the Fourth Carbon Budget Assessment regarding electricity needs up until 2025?
7. Why has the EN-1 document misled Parliament by falsifying the results of the modelling regarding the alleged need for extra capacity up to 2025?
8. Why has the Government wasted time, effort and money on its deliberative discussion on the various pathways to 2050, when in fact the decision to use nuclear power has already been made?
9. Why did the Government repeatedly refused to carry out an assessment of the full potential for the policy that it regards as the most cost-effective (energy efficiency) before making the decision to support new nuclear power stations, despite the fact that the Chief Scientific Adviser described the assessment as crucial?
10. Why did the 2011 White Paper on Energy Market Reform not include a full assessment of energy efficiency despite the fact that one of its principle objectives was to minimise costs to the consumer?
11. Why did Charles Hendry's answer to Madeleine Moon's Parliamentary Question omit information about low-carbon technologies that are cheaper than nuclear power?
12. Why has the Government relied on unsubstantiated claims regarding the expected lifetime of new nuclear power stations?
13. Why has the Government relied on unsubstantiated claims regarding the load factor of new nuclear power stations?
14. Why do the Government's official statistics on the price of nuclear power not include the transmission and distribution costs?
15. Why does the EN-1 document quote a study that doesn't include a comparison with all low carbon technologies, as evidence that nuclear is the cheapest source of electricity?