

Dear Julie Dennett,

I would like to express my most sincere and ardent opposition to the new National Radioactive Waste Management Bill(NRWMB).

The issue of radioactive waste; the poisonous legacy the nuclear industry is leaving for countless future generations to deal with, is one of the most serious and dangerous issues facing humanity today.

I am deeply dismayed and disappointed that the current Labor Government has replaced the widely denounced Commonwealth Radioactive Waste Management Act(CRWMA) with an equally unfair and coercive piece of legislation.

I have met with a number of the traditional custodians from the proposed site of Muckaty Station(120kms north of Tennant Creek), so I know first hand how deceptive and divisive the process of site selection has been and continues to be so!

I know for a fact that the nomination of the Muckaty site is highly contentious and contested. It is essential that the Senate Committee pay due respects to the Traditional Owners by traveling to Tennant Creek to take evidence from them directly.

The 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.

Mr Ferguson is also aware of the unanimous resolution passed by the NT Labor 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, Kim Carr, Peter Garrett and Warren Snowdon among others have acknowledged the distress and opposition of many Muckaty Traditional Owners.

The NRWMB is highly coercive undemocratic.

Section 11 of the bill explicitly overrides any state or territory laws that would hinder site selection. Section 12 then eliminates 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.

I am absolutely appalled that this is the case!

Another concern is that 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.

Again : How can this considered democratic of responsible?

Which brings me to my last point and one which is central to the issues that warrant grave concern about the whole nuclear chain. We desperately need to be transitioning out of toxic polluting industries to clean renewable sources of energy production. The storage of radioactive waste is currently an unresolved issue globally, and one that has dogged the nuclear industry since its inception. Remote, underground storage has never been and is not a responsible or safe option.

US president, Barak Obama's scrapping of the 20year long, proposed underground repository site of Yucca Mountain in Nevada is testament to this. The storage of radioactive waste is a conundrum of the highest order and hence we must be making moves to minimise its production until we are phased out all together. But considering we do currently have to deal with it, the best options are thus :

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 — the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, the Australian Nuclear Association and even Mr Ferguson's own department.

Additionally, requiring ANSTO to store its own waste is the best — and perhaps the only — way of focusing the Organisation's collective mind on the importance of waste minimisation principles. This is the way to ensure there is an imperative to transition out of nuclear energy production.

Finally, 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 1990s, informed by scientific, environmental and social criteria, the Muckaty area did not even make the short-list as a "suitable" site.

These issues must be addressed.

Thankyou for listening to my concerns
Yours sincerely in hope,
Madeline Hudson