

WE DO NOT NEED NUCLEAR POWER TO FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE!

THERE IS A HUGE PROPAGANDA PUSH BY THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY TO JUSTIFY NUCLEAR POWER AS A PANACEA FOR THE REDUCTION OF GLOBAL WARMING GASES.

THIS TABLE ADDRESSES TEN FLAWED ARGUMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF 25 NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AND A RADIOACTIVE WASTE REPOSITORY IN AUSTRALIA.

Claim	Truth
We need nuclear power to combat climate change	It is clear that PM Howard's push for nuclear power generation (NPG) has nothing to do with climate change. Is Howard's nuclear power initiative a front that will necessitate an Australian high-level nuclear waste dump, a dump where American nuclear waste can be stored?
Nuclear power generation (NPG) will reduce our CO ₂ emissions over the short period that we have to drastically reduce them, namely up to 2030	It will not. The first batch of nuclear reactors will not be completed until at least 2020. And in its first 10 years of operation, say from 2020 to 2030, NPG will emit as much CO ₂ as coal-fired power generation.
With the introduction of carbon emissions trading NPG will be cost competitive with coal power generation	Untrue. Two studies show that nuclear power presently costs four times more to generate than coal power and it will do so into the distant future because NPG is a heavy emitter of CO ₂ .
Consumers will pay no more for nuclear-derived electricity than they will for coal-generated electricity	True, our electricity bills will be no more. However, a significant percentage of our income tax will be taken away from spending on health, education etc and go to the nuclear industry to subsidize its costs and give it the massive profits it has always enjoyed.
A nuclear reactor in its day to day operations discharges no radioactive material.	Wrong. A nuclear reactor discharges one million gallons of radioactive water every minute and continuously vents radioactive gases into the air increasing the chances of developing cancer in the adjacent population.
The risk of a meltdown due to mechanical/human error or terrorist attack is so incredibly low it is not credible	Hardly! The Union of Concerned Scientists considers that it is not a matter of <i>if</i> a meltdown will occur in one or more of the US 103 reactors, but <i>when</i> !
The medical consequences of a meltdown are over dramatized. After all, only 50 people died at Chernobyl (According to	5000 to 10,000 cleanup operators died prematurely, in Belarus over 8000 people developed thyroid cancer and 40% of the

<p>Foreign Minister Alexander Downer in 2005)</p>	<p>European land mass remains radioactive.</p>
<p>Nuclear waste can be safely stored in underground repositories for the 10,000 years it remains radioactive</p>	<p>It remains radioactive for 500,000 years! It is impossible to prevent water seeping through the rock walls of an underground tunnel for 50 years, let alone 500,000. Once in the tunnel it corrodes the metal casks holding the waste causing radioactivity to leak into the invading water, then into ground water and then into creeks and rivers.</p>
<p>We have a moral obligation to take back and store the nuclear waste produced from the uranium we export to other countries</p>	<p>We should stop exporting uranium so that no more nuclear waste is generated from our uranium.</p>
<p>Nuclear power must be in 'the mix' of future electricity providers because renewable energy providers like solar, wind etc cannot do it on their own</p>	<p>Untrue. A mixture of 'renewables' - solar, wind, geothermal, cogeneration, biomass and hydropower can supply our future power needs with nary a nuclear power or coal power plant in sight!</p>