

May 29, 2021

Dear NRCan Board Members:

The global COVID-19 pandemic and the climate emergency have much in common, and yet the climate emergency is only now becoming the real concern that it has been for over three decades. The climate emergency requires the fastest, most expedient and affordable response so as to cause the least number of deaths from late and faulty actions. Please consider the following:

- Solar, wind, energy storage, conservation and efficiency are already very successful in accomplishing this mission and are now the lowest cost to produce electricity. Their environmental footprint is the lowest as well.
- The so-called “Advanced Reactors” are non-existent, unproven, expensive, and will provide the slowest response to the climate crisis – if proven viable. SMRs are self-serving to the nuclear industry.
- SMRs are likely to divert government funding away from renewables to nuclear for spurious reasons that is unlikely to mitigate the climate emergency.
- New nuclear is an impediment to meeting the Paris Accord to keep the global temperature from rising above 1.5 degrees C by 2050. It is too little and too late.
- Nuclear power is much further handicapped by the chronic absence of permanent safe nuclear waste storage locations. After 70-plus years of producing radioactive waste, this problem has still not been solved or approved in Canada, or anywhere in the world. This is a profound failure that should remove nuclear power from any future consideration for producing energy. Nuclear power must be banned from building any new reactors until the waste problem has been satisfactorily solved.
- The cost of decommissioning aging reactors and the permanent safe storage of nuclear waste is not calculated into the cost of producing SMRs – as it should be.
- Radioactive waste must never be abandoned. Rolling stewardship is the only responsible way forward; this is the responsible solution for the error made in

developing nuclear energy and weaponry that will remain a threat to future civilizations and nature for many thousands of years to come.

- With no insurance company willing to insure nuclear power, the unwitting taxpayer will hold the liability for any nuclear accident or failure by the industry to deliver what they are being paid to do with taxpayer funding. In other words, the taxpayer may well have to pay twice – for the building and the failure of SMRs.
- Importantly, Canada is committed to the [Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons](#), “including the full implementation of safeguards sent by the International Atomic Energy Agency.”

All of this is well known by NRCan and the proponents of nuclear. It is therefore confounding and downright insulting to the next generations of Canadians that they will be saddled with an egregious liability that is sure to reduce their own likelihood of survival. Nuclear supporters must stop seeking public funding for their own interests. Instead, we need to increase funding for already proven renewable energy sources, energy storage, conservation and efficiency to address the climate emergency to the best of our ability and as soon as possible.

My question: How much longer will it be before NRCan and all other proponents of nuclear energy come to the foregone conclusion they are wrong about nuclear energy, and a are detriment to meeting the climate emergency?

Samuel Arnold  
Sustainable Energy Group

[REDACTED]

Woodstock, N.B.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]