

From:
To: [Legal and Constitutional, Committee \(SEN\);](#)
Subject: Senate Inquiry - Nuclear Waste Dump
Date: Friday, 5 March 2010 5:39:00 PM

Beverley and John Inshaw

5th March 2010

Ms Julie Dennett,
Committee Secretary,
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee,
PO Box 6100
Parliament House,
Canberra ACT
2600

Dear Ms Dennett,
I have prepared this submission on behalf of my wife, Beverley, and myself.
We share a common view.

We understand that the Commonwealth Parliament is considering a bill to establish a radioactive waste storage facility in the Northern Territory with Muckaty Station being the likely location.

We are opposed to this proposal and submit the following comments to the Senate Inquiry considering this matter,

We believe that Australia should not engage in any activity which produces radioactive waste. However, as this waste already exists we believe that nuclear waste should be moved as little as possible to reduce the risk of mishap. It should be stored above ground preferably on the site where the waste is produced and where nuclear expertise is readily available to ensure the security of the waste and to ensure the safety of the community at large.

In view of the fact that Muckaty Station is being considered for this facility we think it essential that the Senate Committee visit the site and pay due respect to the traditional owners of the land and to take evidence from them directly.

Our understanding of the Bill is that it is highly coercive in that it overrides all relevant state and territory legislation. We also understand that it overrides Aboriginal heritage protections. The proposal has the ability to override private property rights of any affected individuals. Once the site is chosen it

will be assessed under commonwealth environmental legislation which has little if any mechanisms for preventing the proposal from going ahead.

It seems to us that a case for the need of a remote dump has never been established. A remote dump is the only option that has ever been considered and the nuclear industry has never made a case that says a remote dump is the best place to keep this waste.

We understand that the Bill gives the Minister the sole responsibility of assessing whether the dump should be established at Muckety or not. This is completely unacceptable to us. No information is given regarding the assessment criteria for the dump site.

Finally, we deplore the aspect of the Bill which gives the local people at the dump site no right of appeal.

Yours faithfully,

John Inshaw