


Procedure file

Basic information		
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1996/2193(COS)	Procedure rejected
Nuclear industries in the Union		
Subject 3.60.04 Nuclear energy, industry and safety		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	ENER Research, Technological Development and Energy		19/11/1996
		PPE SOULIER André	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	ENVI Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection		21/11/1996
		ELDR DYBKJÆR Lone	
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
25/09/1996	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1996)0339	Summary
23/10/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
16/04/1997	Vote in committee		Summary
15/05/1997	Debate in Parliament		Summary
15/05/1997	Decision by Parliament	A4-0131/1997	
15/05/1997	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1996/2193(COS)
Procedure type	COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)
Procedure subtype	Commission strategy paper
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 142
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure rejected
Committee dossier	ENER/4/08280

Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document	COM(1996)0339	25/09/1996	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	A4-0131/1997 OJ C 150 19.05.1997, p. 0002	16/04/1997	EP	
Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report	CES0470/1997 OJ C 206 07.07.1997, p. 0088	24/04/1997	ESC	Summary

Nuclear industries in the Union

OBJECTIVE : to identify common principles with a view to maintaining the contribution of nuclear power to the energy supply. SUBSTANCE: In its communication, the Commission emphasizes that proper handling of nuclear energy, including the issue of irradiated fuel and waste disposal is a priority objective. Use of nuclear energy has beneficial effects in terms of energy supply security, fuel imports, know-how in the field of high technology, skilled jobs and the reduction of CO2 emissions. It also poses problems owing to concerns over safety, transport, waste management, decommissioning and non-proliferation. All these aspects merit careful attention at all times. Almost 40 years after the signing of the Euratom Treaty, the European Community has a mature nuclear industry covering the entire fuel cycle. However, the European Union and some of its Member States may, in the context of a future energy supply strategy, review the role of nuclear energy alongside other alternatives. Consequently, the Commission believes that, in order to provide a framework for the continuing contribution of nuclear energy to the energy supply, some common principles have to be followed. The suggested principles are: - the right to decide to develop or not the peaceful use of nuclear energy belongs to each Member State; - the choice made in this regard by any of the Member States has to be respected; - Member States having chosen to use nuclear energy need, in parallel, to ensure a high degree of nuclear safety, respect the non-proliferation requirements provided for in the relevant international agreements in force, as well as a high level of human health protection; - while it is individual Member States who are responsible for setting safety standards and licensing nuclear installations, and national operators who are responsible for their safe operation, both share collective responsibility towards all European citizens for ensuring nuclear safety. Moreover, a high degree of nuclear safety within the Community alone is not sufficient. Nuclear safety improvements in CEECs and in the NISs are also needed, and to achieve this, the combined efforts of the Member States, the European Community, the partner countries and the wider international community are essential. ?

Nuclear industries in the Union

Mr Andre SOULIER (F, EPP) saw his report on the Commission's communication on the nuclear industries in the EU adopted. a majority of the Committee followed its rapporteur by stating that, as long as there is no alternative to nuclear power, which currently accounts for one third of electricity production, investment must be continued. However given the fact that the nuclear industry is open to controversy and that public opinion is calling for an improvement in safety, the Committee made it clear that there can be no reduction in investment in research and development. The draftsman noted that the Commission programme does not tackle the question of ageing of the great majority of existing nuclear installations, though even investment will be needed for their renewal at the beginning of the next century. The Committee also pointed out that spent fuel from nuclear reactors cannot be stored indefinitely on closed down production sites until all the necessary political and economic decisions have been taken.?

Nuclear industries in the Union

The publication of the Draft Illustrative Nuclear Programme is welcomed. The extent of public concern, the deregulation and opening up of (in most Member States) a hitherto secure market which has been conducive to long term capital intensive investments, plus the arrival of competitively priced natural gas produced in smaller, more efficient and cheaper generation plants, are crucial factors which make it unlikely that nuclear generation will be continued in most Member States when existing plants come to the end of their operating lives in the years after 2005-2010. The prospect of such a development must raise serious strategic questions for EU energy policy. For, the loss of most of its nuclear generation would not only compromise the EU's ability to ensure satisfactory security of supply conditions in respect to the future import of fuel for electricity generation, it would also powerfully counteract the EU's efforts to reduce its CO2 emissions. It is a serious omission that the Commission's document fails to bring out the importance of the above strategic issues, or to assess adequately their likely impact on the EU's energy policy. The Commission is called upon to address these issues specifically in its final version of the Illustrative Nuclear Programme, to reach clear conclusions, and to give guidance to the parties involved, as well as to the public, about the realities ahead. Regarding the dangers which may arise from nuclear facilities to the east of the EU, there should not be any doubt as to the deeply damaging effect on public attitudes if there were to be another major nuclear accident. The PHARE and TACIS programmes have been valuable, but they are coming under increasing criticism. In so far as these programmes deal with nuclear safety, the Commission is urged to review them as a matter of urgency, and then to publish the results. The Commission is also asked to consider including attention to dangerous nuclear military installations within the scope of its activities. ?

Nuclear industries in the Union

Parliament rejected the report by Mr André SOULIER (PPE, F) on the communication from the Commission on the nuclear industries in the European Union (Illustrative nuclear programme according to Article 40 of the Euratom Treaty). The rapporteur himself recommended that the whole of the motion for a resolution be rejected as its substance had been altered by the amendments that had been adopted. At the outset, Mr Soulier generally supported the Commission communication, though made criticisms on a number of points. He recognized that, as long as there was no alternative to nuclear power, it would be necessary to continue with investment, which is also a source of long-term jobs and contributes to local economies. Given the continuing trend for uranium ore prices to rise, he felt the EU should ensure autonomy of supply. The

rapporteur mentioned three main challenges posed by nuclear power: - gaining public confidence: the nuclear industries must 'enlighten' and aim to establish common standards for the manufacture of equipment and for the operation of installations, - dismantling or replacement of ageing power stations: the Commission's illustrative programme unfortunately does not address the problem of power stations having reached the end of their life, - waste management and disposal: decisions have to be taken about the final disposal of high-level radioactive waste. During the vote, a number of amendments were adopted which resulted in the deletion of the references to continued investment in the nuclear sector. Other amendments called for a stop to uranium enrichment or for the costing of nuclear energy to include all the costs of research, production, transport and waste reprocessing and storage and for all such costs to be borne by the undertakings concerned, EU contributions being allowed only in respect of the safety of currently operational reactors. Parliament would thus have argued that other types of energy, such as renewable varieties, had greater job-creation potential. Taking the view that his report had been totally altered, Mr Soulier himself recommended that it be rejected. The motion for a resolution was thus rejected by 211 votes to 129, with 13 abstentions.