

11th September, 2020

THE REVIEW OF THE LANDS ACQUISITION ACT 1989

I refer to the above act, therefore forward some sentiment to your invitation of feedback.

I am an illustrator, and now concerned citizen. Projects have included mining, uranium, conservation, fisheries, department of mines and energy, education. This has been usually for publication and or communication. Sometimes, insight is gained not always visible to others, and may offer solutions. I have since 1971 covered most topics, therefore for the purpose of the subject of your review, having deconstructed projects to illustrate them. The below is my personal opinion, from experience covering some of the subject matter.

My terms of reference is: 124 (1) MINING ON CERTAIN LAND

The regulation may make provision for any relation to prohibiting or regulating all or any of the following matters.

- (a) The exploration for minerals on relevant land
- (b) The mining for, or recovery of minerals on or from relevant land
- (c) The carrying on of operations and the execution of works, for a purpose referred to in paragraph (a) or (b)

Within the review of the Lands Acquisition Act of 1989 (LAA), your committee may collectively consider the below personal comments. Whilst the recovery of minerals or resources may be the main goal of Australia's exploration and mining.

The environment is in its worst state since man, The UN Nature report, Paris of May 2019 with input from Australia, asks for a careful rescue plan. As the planet is in its worst state since man. This is no far off country. This includes Australia.

Where is our rescue plan? The UN report asks or begs all countries to conserve resources.

The below, is my personal insight, this having commenced after following the plight of stressed of farmers on television and newspapers, through necessity engage their local MP's in 2018 to protect their farms, in my own state of South Australia from exploration and mining. Many, owners of viable farming land, producing food for Australia, then having to fight mining companies in court. The farmer winning, then the mining company appealing. This must only happen in Australia. (Imagine exploring under the vines of the Chianti vineyards of Italy or the Champagne districts of France or under the Houses of Parliament in London, or under the Pyramids of Egypt, as examples? Sounds stupid? Well. It is.)

There is something wrong here. Why are Australian government bodies handing out licenses to prospect and mine on or under these valuable family farming properties, zones and others? There is little agriculture land in Australia. Surely any ore can be left in the ground. Otherwise everything will be dug up inclusive of roads, churches, towns in the search for minerals. Where does this stop? Would you eat food produced on a reclaimed mine site, that was previously a farm? Or a farm next to one.

On another mining topic, Nuclear waste dumps are just reverse uranium mines, requiring all the approvals of a new mine in my view. I have with others watched the long process of having to locate a site for Australia's nuclear waste inclusive of legacy waste from Australia's uranium ore customers. Australia has had more than 40 years to do this, or have a solution. This site procured in my view by ambush, bait and exclusion or our indigenous people of the zone. These are not just my words. I am just an outsider looking in. Australia has a moral duty to have a secure solution to this waste. Or not export further uranium ore or approve further mines. Our country should also consider and know what IS PRODUCED from our exported uranium ore? Australia should be responsible for letting this stuff loose onto the world. At what point do we stop exporting uranium and approving new mines? This stuff in the wrong hands or country. Can be dangerous.

SOME ZONES SHOULD BE EXEMPT
FROM EXPLORATION AND MINING. FULL STOP.

These should be zones of:

(1) INDIGENOUS AND FIRST AUSTRALIAN LANDS OF CULTURE, SITES AND HISTORY

The destruction of The Juukan Caves, Western Australia is a current example of where mining approval has gone wrong, and no one is worried about the embarrassment and damage to Australia's reputation. For a small amount of iron ore.

What is a reputation worth one asks?

Make these zones places of interest and employment for indigenous tourism, as have other countries. We have something great in Australia - the oldest living culture. Why destroy it, by legislation? It is Australian law, that is allowing this destruction. Why blame a mining company, afterwards.

(2) ZONES OF VIABLE FARMING LAND, VITICULTURE AND AGRICULTURE - or food production

Why destroy viable Australian farming land for short term mines, rendering this land toxic? Would anyone want to eat or export this produce anyway? Why allow good farming land to be used as a nuclear waste bin? Or even consider this. Or ask a farmer to give or volunteer his land. Think of what this will do to adjoining farming land. The future of our children is at stake here. Would they want to farm or live close to a nuclear waste zone. Young people are more educated in the subject of environment and responsibility, than most adults. And it is the adults that make the decisions. Some are poorly considered. I have yet to see one Australian mining or joint venture company, put their hands up to responsibly volunteer their short term uranium mine (copper, and other metals as

bonus) or offer help Australia's nuclear waste disposal dilemma, having benefited from it. After all, they export nuclear waste.

Mines have short lifespans in years, depending and calculated on water, evaporation and tailing dam capacity. Average 20-30 years. If there is 100 years of uranium, how big would this void be, and is it really possible to mine? I would be concerned of a Tailings Dam bursting !!! A good possibility..

All questions should be answered before approval of any mine. And uranium mines should not be approved without within their design, capacity to store and bury nuclear waste. We want to dispose of it, not build monuments to it.

The Lifespan, Those Affected, And the Rehabilitation of the mine site should be mandatory as part of the initial or any amended Environmental Impact Statement in my view. A holistic approach, with all or most of the answers, first.

.

(3) ENDANGERED ENVIRONMENT AND WATERWAYS CONTAINING ENDANGERED FLORA AND FAUNA

Surely by 2020 we know where our endangered species are. And we do not need mining companies to tell us they have found some of these species. The recent Black-Throated Finch in Queensland is a prime example. Currently Australia is becoming an embarrassment to the world. Do we really need to remove all resources, when we are asked to save our environment. (Perhaps, remove the lot. Give mining companies, and overseas all our terrain to ship off, burn and build more nuclear weapons.) No environment means no oxygen, as this is the product of plants. No one appears to rehabilitate after mining, and no one appears to care. There are no cradle to grave plans, inclusive of rehabilitation. Imagine the amount of terrain removed during long term mining? It may not matter because, YOU MAY NOT BE HERE TO SEE IT.!!

SUMMARY: In the future, Australia may not need many new mines. Through careful recycling, our needs could be met. Mining companies could morph into recyclers of their product, having had it returned. A cradle to grave sustainable operation. Perhaps nuclear waste could be recycled and made into new products for medical purposes. We would not need to approve more uranium mines. Does anyone ask, what do our uranium customers really make with our uranium? Do we really want our uranium to fuel nuclear warheads. And why are these being built, for what purpose, using who's uranium? Why do we need to export more, for 'who' to stockpile, for what. This is a good time to take stock, and ask these questions. New recycling, responsible industries could eventuate. And fewer destructive mines approved. Coal mines could be rehabilitated with plastic waste, broken down. We would just argue that we are just placing it back into the place of where it came as a derivative of coal and oil. Other plastics can be recycled over and over. Nuclear waste needs to go back into the hole of where it came, with like rocks, whilst rehabilitating uranium mines in Australia. Starting in South Australia. Otherwise, Australia should stop approving more uranium mines until they have a solution to legacy waste.

People are still waiting for answers. These should have been placed onto the public arena, before looking for a site or solution to nuclear waste. People should know what they are voting for! Have all the questions been answered?

Even the stupid ones. Where the roads go, the transport, the safety, the design? The cost. And who or how it will be paid for?

If uranium mines were a one stop exercise, providing progressive nuclear waste disposal in the cradle of where it came. This could be paid for by the customer wishing their nuclear waste disposed. Providing jobs, rehabilitating the mine. No new environment would be harmed by this process. We are using the original hole or mine void, The uranium mines' original township is there and the transport infrastructure. The uranium ore is just going back as waste, to break down, where it originally came. Some could be recycled by new industry. We would not need more uranium mines in the future! Open cut mines should be rehabilitated to stop erosion and long wall mining may have dire consequences as layers collapse, on research. Mining damages the earth, habitats will not return inclusive of animal species. Please be very careful as to where those mining and exploration licenses are issued. Some zones, should be exempt.

I trust the above comments may be included in your discussion, some discarded and others implemented.

I give my permission for this submission to be made public.

I thank your Project Team for the opportunity to add my insight into your review.