

I oppose South Australia (or anywhere in Australia) becoming the Nuclear waste dump to the world. I know some may want to call it a “facility” rather than a “dump”, but I think even the word “dump” is too kind for it.

South Australia has many valuable industries that would be damaged by us becoming the world’s nuclear dump, for example: tourism, wine, dairy, tuna, grains, sheep, beef. The damage would be immediate to our image. If a spill occurred, if a container sunk in our gulf, if an explosion or a chemical fire occurred in a container - then South Australia would be doubly cursed.

This would be a liability to our state and future generations. The only people who will get rich are consultants, infrastructure barons, nuclear lobbyists and those people receiving secret benefits for their lobbying efforts.

The US nuclear industry would love a “patsy” to take all their waste, then they could continue expanding their industry and make more profits. It was their decision to convert our Uranium into highly poisonous waste, it is their problem - we have no obligation to take it back. The term “fuel leasing” is just a sugar coated way of saying we will be a radioactive waste dump.

The report tries to make it sound that a worker being exposed to Plutonium dust can be equated to a few CT scans, or a couple of X-rays. This is very misleading. It’s like comparing being scratched by a piece of glass with swallowing a piece of glass. A tiny speck of Plutonium in the lungs (or liver or bones) is potentially deadly.

Every stage of moving this waste will involve unacceptable risk. The risks to workers handling this nuclear waste is unacceptable. The risk of a shipment falling into our oceans is unacceptable.

The nuclear waste will be stored above ground for decades. This will probably end up being forever - it is far cheaper for businesses to go “bust” and run away with the profits than lose money on some expensive, experimental undergrounding process.

An above ground facility will make South Australia and the whole of Australia vulnerable. The containers could be damaged by: earthquake, missile strike, terrorist bomb, aircraft crash, concrete cancer, chemical fire, even a rare meteor. Multiply small risks by vast times and you have significant risk. One missile strike on the containers and it would be a “dirty bomb” for all of Australia. Dust storms would be able to spread the radioactive dust to any part of Australia. A nuclear waste dump creates a huge vulnerability for Australia’s security.

So should it be called a waste dump or a storage facility? I think there is a more appropriate term:
It is a “betrayal” facility. A betrayal to the Aboriginal people whose land will be used for such a facility. It is a betrayal to future generations who will have to deal with the inevitable environmental and economic “fall out” of such a facility. It is a betrayal to all workers who will have to handle this ultra-poisonous waste. It is a betrayal to our present successful industries who will be diminished by such a facility. It is a betrayal to our nation’s security.

Short term profit for a few - long term pain for Australia and its tax payers.

Leave it where it is until some future technology can reprocess it safely in situ.
