

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



16/03/10

Dear Ms Dennett,

I would like to make a submission to the National Radioactive Waste Management Bill 2010 (NRWMB, 2010), for the committee's consideration.

The nomination of the Muckaty site is highly contested. It is essential that the Senate Committee pay due respects to the Traditional Owners by travelling to Fennant Creek to take evidence from <sup>them</sup> directly.

The ~~nomination~~ nomination of the Muckaty site by the Northern Land Council was highly controversial and is strongly contested by many Traditional Owners. Resources Minister, Martin Ferguson claims that Ngapa Traditional Owners support the nomination of the Muckaty site but he knows that many Ngapa Traditional Owners oppose the dump - as well as numerous requests for meetings, he received a letter opposing the dump in May 2009 signed by 25 Ngapa Traditional Owners and 32 Traditional Owners from other Muckaty groups.

Ferguson.  
Mr. is also aware of the unanimous resolution passed by the NT Labour conference in April 2008 which called on the Federal Government to exclude Muckaty on the grounds that the nomination "was not made with the full and informed consent of all Traditional Owners and affected people and as such does not comply with the Aboriginal Land Rights Act". Mr. Ferguson also knows that fellow Ministers Jenny Macklin, Tim Carr, Peter Garrett and Warren Snowdon, among others have acknowledged the distress and opposition of many Muckaty Traditional Owners.

This bill is highly coercive, section 11 of the bill explicitly overrides any state or territory laws that would hinder site selection.

Section 12 then eliminates ~~Aboriginal~~ Aboriginal interests (the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984) and environmental interests (the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999) from the process of choosing a site.

Section 13 eliminates the property rights of any individual unlucky enough to be in the path of the dump or its access corridors.

Once a site is chosen, it will be assessed under Commonwealth environmental legislation which has almost no mechanisms for preventing the project from going ahead.

All discretion is in the hands of the Minister; the Bill places enormous 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.

The case for a remote dump has never been made. Nuclear waste should be moved as little as possible and should be stored above ground, close to the point of production, close to centres of nuclear expertise and infrastructure. The Lucas Heights nuclear agency ANSTO is by far the biggest single source of the waste, and all the relevant organisations have acknowledged that ongoing waste storage at Lucas Heights is a viable option - Australian Nuclear, Science and Technology Organisation, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, the Nuclear Association, and even Mr Ferguson's own department. Additionally, requiring Ansto to store its own waste is the best and perhaps only way of ~~focus~~ focussing the Organisation's collective mind on the importance of waste minimisation principles.

Any site selection process ought to be based on scientific and environmental siting criteria, as well as on the principle of voluntarism. In 2005, the Howard government chose the NT, and ruled out NSW, for purely political reasons. When the Federal Bureau of Resource Sciences conducted a national repository site selection study in the 1990's, informed by scientific, environmental and social criteria, the Muckaty area did not even make the short-listed as a suitable site

yours sincerely

Mich Kastralatic

