

To: [Legal and Constitutional, Committee \(SEN\);](#)
cc: [Scott Ludlam;](#)
Subject: Nuclear dump
Date: Friday, 5 March 2010 2:13:05 PM

Dear Senators,

Many years ago, as a contributor to the nuclear waste debate, I was included in the mailing list of the committee then set up. This was the usual whitewash effort which tried to persuade us that the decision on low and medium level waste disposal would be made on the basis of largely technical considerations. We were treated to glossy material presumably costing millions which supposedly would allow us to come to meaningful conclusions as to an appropriate site.

Unfortunately, it was clear that the major decisions on the nature of the disposal methods had already been made. This did not come as a surprise given that the proposals themselves had already pre-empted most of the important decisions. It was clear that this phoney process could not come to a meaningful solution. I therefore sent a letter to the committee dissociating myself from the process. I also said that regardless of "scientific" pretence, the ultimate decision would be to dump the waste on *out of sight out of mind* aboriginal land, paying minimal if any compensation. This non-decision would be rubber-stamped by an illegally constituted native body created for the purpose, because the normal aboriginal decision-making process would be deemed too slow and unreliable.

As predicted, all this has now come to pass. We appear to have arrived at the final stage of the sham consultation, in which the Senate is to set its seal on the land expropriation. What you are asked to do may be legal in the sense that you have the power to do it, but is totally unsustainable from the humanitarian and environmental points of view. As has been pointed out, technically unsophisticated landowners have no experience (nor has anyone else) to deal with permanently poisonous material which gives no outward sign of its toxicity. The only place to store the waste is where it was generated and where, at least for the time being, a technical apparatus exists for its supervision.

As this is not going to happen, the least you can do is to settle on a substantial rent in perpetuity which, while not able to compensate the owners of the land, would at least act as a permanent reminder to the financial apparatchiks in parliament that the agreement exists and requires constant servicing.

Respectfully,

Gerry Harant