

[REDACTED]

To the committee,

The treaty signs away Australia's ability to develop a domestic full cycle nuclear energy program. The IAEA doesn't frown upon nuclear energy programs nor are national nuclear energy programs forbidden by any nuclear non-proliferation treaty. This is a new constraint upon Australia's nuclear technology development for the operational life of the submarines. Unlike how nuclear programs usually work by developing a country's technical expertise in nuclear technology this will not. This is a practical non-proliferation measure because historically countries in possession of highly enriched uranium can rapidly reprocess that material into nuclear weapons and face a high degree of suspicion when possessing reprocessing capabilities and weapons grade fissile material.

I am concerned that negotiations for this project seems to be conducted under the impression that Australia will pay any price to obtain nuclear submarines. In plain English. Article IV C says that the U.S.A. and U.K. set the price of the fuel if it's special fuel. Australia can't open the can to check the contents so it will always be special fuel or specified as such. It all but guarantees cartel fuel prices. D says Australia needs to store the nuclear material after it expires. E and Article V says that Australia can't hold them responsible if there is a problem because their manuals are poorly written like forgetting to mention that it will nosedive like a 747 if a certain switch isn't toggled or if they send dodgy parts. Then Defence minister Marise Payne undertook to avoid this exact problem in the future after that \$125m EA-18G Growler exploded on the showroom floor in 2019. If that happens again with the submarine what's the contingency plan for if it melts down on the first day in Sydney Harbour like a very radioactive and expensive Guardian class patrol boat?

If it doesn't come with a full service manual, technical specifications and tolerances so that there is an option to manufacture parts and fuel domestically then it's not fit for purpose. It's the only way to set an upper price limit on parts by ensuring that no part exceeds the cost of bespoke manufacturing.

Robert Heron

[REDACTED]