

**From:** [REDACTED] Paul Savi  
**To:** [Committee, Environment \(REPS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I say NO to Nuclear Power Generation  
**Date:** Thursday, 8 August 2019 6:36:59 AM

---

# Dear Committee I wish to say a resounding: 'NO' TO NUCLEAR POWER IN AUSTRALIA

For the following reasons:

## **UNNECESSARY**

We don't need nuclear power. Several renewable energy sources - such as bioenergy, geothermal 'hot rocks', solar thermal electricity with storage, and sometimes hydroelectricity - can provide reliable baseload electricity. Renewable power generation worldwide has doubled over the past decade and now accounts for well over twice as much generation as nuclear power.

*More information:* [www.yes2renewables.org](http://www.yes2renewables.org)

## **NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

Nuclear power is the one and only energy source with a direct and repeatedly-demonstrated connection to the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. For example, the first and only serious push for nuclear power in Australia was driven by a hidden weapons agenda as then PM John Gorton later acknowledged.

*More information:* [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/power-weapons](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/power-weapons)

## **ACCIDENTS, ATTACKS & ROUTINE EMISSIONS**

In addition to the risk of accidents, nuclear power reactors are vulnerable to disasters from sabotage, terrorism, or the use of conventional forces to attack nuclear facilities during war.

*More information:* [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/military-and-terrorist-attacks-on-nuclear-plants](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/military-and-terrorist-attacks-on-nuclear-plants)

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation notes that international cancer incidence and mortality data demonstrate statistically-significant links between radiation and all solid tumours as a group, as well as for cancers of the stomach,

colon, liver, lung, breast, ovary, bladder, thyroid, and for non-melanoma skin cancers and most types of leukaemia.

More information: [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/radiation](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/radiation)

## WHERE WOULD THE REACTORS BE LOCATED?

Do you live near one of the 19 areas most likely to be targeted for nuclear power reactors in Australia?

See the Australia Institute's Web Paper #40, 'Siting Nuclear Power Plants in Australia: Where would they go?', [www.tai.org.au/documents/downloads/WP96.pdf](http://www.tai.org.au/documents/downloads/WP96.pdf)

### NUCLEAR WASTE

The 2006 Switkowski Report envisaged the construction of 25 power reactors, which would produce up to 45,000 tonnes of high-level nuclear waste. There is not a single permanent repository for spent fuel or high-level nuclear waste anywhere in the world.

More information: [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/waste](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/waste) and [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/waste-import](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/waste-import)

### DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Democratic rights have often been trampled in the pursuit of nuclear projects. The Howard government sought legal advice on its powers to override state laws banning nuclear power plants. The Rudd/Gillard Labor government tried to impose a nuclear waste dump in the NT despite the opposition of many Traditional Owners and NT legislation banning the imposition of nuclear dumps. The Abbott/Turnbull Coalition government has been equally undemocratic and racist.

### COST

Too cheap to meter, or too expensive to matter? The nuclear power industry survives only because of huge taxpayer subsidies. Construction costs are spiralling, e.g. an estimated A\$40 billion for two reactors at Hinkley Point in the UK.

### REDUCED PROPERTY PRICES. COMPULSORY LAND ACQUISITION. NO INSURANCE.

A nuclear power plant would reduce local property values. The government may use compulsory land acquisition powers to seize land for reactors - just as it has previously seized land for a nuclear waste dump. Insurance companies do not insure against the risk of nuclear accidents.

### WATER

Nuclear power is the thirstiest of all the energy sources. Reactors typically consume 35-65

million litres of water per day.

More information: [www.nuclear.foe.org.au/water](http://www.nuclear.foe.org.au/water)

### **TOO SLOW**

It would probably take 15 years or more to develop nuclear power in Australia. Clean energy solutions can be deployed much quicker.

More information: Nuclear Monitor #806, 25 June 2016, 'Nuclear power: No solution to climate change', [www.wiseinternational.org/nuclear-monitor/806/nuclear-power-no-solution-climate-change](http://www.wiseinternational.org/nuclear-monitor/806/nuclear-power-no-solution-climate-change)

### **GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS**

Nuclear power emits three times more greenhouse gases than wind power according to the 2006 Switkowski Report. Nuclear power is also far more greenhouse intensive than energy efficiency measures.

More information: Nuclear Monitor #806, 25 June 2016, 'Nuclear power: No solution to climate change', [www.wiseinternational.org/nuclear-monitor/806/nuclear-power-no-solution-climate-change](http://www.wiseinternational.org/nuclear-monitor/806/nuclear-power-no-solution-climate-change)

I remain,  
Your faithfully,  
Paul Savi

