From: Kevin Shaw

Sent: Wednesday, 17 March 2010 1:08 PM

To: Legal and Constitutional, Committee (SEN)

Cc: Ludlam, Scott (Senator)

Subject: Proposed: Nuclear waste dump at Muckaty Station & Repeal

Commonwealth Radioactive Waste Management Act

Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee

Dear Committee Members

I respectfully submit as follows:

1. For the purpose of ${\tt Good}$ ${\tt Governance}$ and ${\tt Democratic}$ ${\tt Process}$ the ${\tt Committee}$ consults also with

affected Traditional Owners and Custodians.

For the purpose of good governance and democratic process it is important that the Senate Committee

consult with Traditional Owners and Custodians directly affected by travelling to Tennant Creek to take evidence from them.

2. The case for a remote dump has never been made.

The radioactive waste management debate in Australia has never looked at options other than remote

waste dumps on Aboriginal land. The industry has never made the case that a remote shed is the best

place for this material.

3. This bill is coercive and contemptuous of established democratic traditions, entitlements, rights

and protections at law.

In choosing a site, the proposed bill overrides all relevant state and territory legislation as well as

overriding commonwealth environmental and Aboriginal heritage protections. It also overrides private

property rights of affected individuals with regards the dump site or its access route. Once a site is $\frac{1}{2}$

chosen, it will be assessed under commonwealth environmental legislation which has almost no

mechanisms for preventing the project from going ahead.

4. Disproportionate power placed in the hands of the Minister.

The Bill places disproportionate power in the hands of the Minister to assess whether or not the Muckaty

site should go ahead. No information is given to how this assessment will be carried out, and the bill

makes it clear that local people have no right of appeal.

5. We must do better than this.

Nuclear waste should be as minimal as possible and moved as little as possible. It should be stored

securely above ground immediate to the point of production, and thereby within centres of nuclear

expertise and infrastructure to deal with the problems when they arise. Yours sincerely

Kevin Shaw