



PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION
of Australia Inc

NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

The Public Health Association of Australia notes that:

1. There are public health risks of the nuclear chain (mining, processing, nuclear power, waste and weapons proliferation) particularly of nuclear power generation and reprocessing.^{1,2}
2. The links all along the nuclear chain between the nuclear power industry and waste production and nuclear weapons proliferation and hence the risk of nuclear war, are inextricable.
3. In a time of environmental degradation and climate change, the threat of nuclear weapons makes nuclear disarmament one of the highest priorities for protecting humanity, complex society and the environment.
4. The consequences to the environment of the nuclear chain are increased radioactive contamination of the environment.³
5. The risks of radioactive spillage and environmental contamination, however, low are inherent in transporting nuclear waste.
6. The nuclear power industry is not able to mitigate global warming.^{4,5,6}
7. In an age of increasing globalisation and political tension, nuclear facilities provide a source of nuclear material for terrorists to use in weapons.⁷

The Public Health Association of Australia believes that:

8. Expansion of the nuclear industry is not in Australia's or the world's health interest.

The Public Health Association of Australia resolves that:

9. It will oppose expansion of the nuclear industry in Australia, in particular mining and waste disposal from overseas.
10. It will collaborate with other organisations with similar aims.
11. It will act to further implement its policy on Climate Change.

References:

1. E Cardis, M Vrijheid, M Blettner et al. Risk of cancer after low doses of ionising radiation: retrospective cohort study in 15 countries (BMJ, doi:10.1136/bmj.38499.599861.E0 (published 29 June 2005)). On the basis of these estimates, 1-2% of deaths from cancer among workers in this cohort may be attributable to radiation.
2. **Garwin**, Richard L., 2001, "Can the World Live With Nuclear Power?" www.nci.org/conf/garwin/index.htm quoted in Green, J *Nuclear Power No Solution to Climate Change*, FoEA, ACF, Greenpeace et al, 2005. Garwin ... applies a risk estimate of 0.04 fatal cancers per person - Sievert, to calculate that a once-through cycle results in six cancer deaths per gigawatt-year of nuclear output, or 14 deaths with reprocessing.
3. WISE-Paris, 2001, "Possible Toxic Effects from the Nuclear Reprocessing Plants at Sellafield and Cap de la Hague", European Parliament Directorate General for Research, www.wise-paris.org/english/stoa_en.html Quoted in Green, J *Nuclear Power No Solution to Climate Change*, FoEA, ACF, Greenpeace et al, 2005. Radioactive contamination from these facilities [Cogema's reprocessing plant at La Hague in France, and BNFL's plant at Sellafield in the UK] can be traced through the Irish Sea, the North Sea, along the Norwegian coast into the Arctic and Atlantic Oceans, and gives rise to elevated contamination levels in biota.
4. Tait, P A Brief Overview on *Why Nuclear Power is Not The Answer to Global Warming* May05 at <http://www.dea.org.au/> in Reports
5. Green, J *Nuclear Power No Solution to Climate Change*, FoEA, ACF, Greenpeace et al, 2005
6. Roberts, Alan ABC Radio Interview with Terry Lane Nuclear power and climate change, Sunday 17 April 2005, at <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/natint/stories/s1345468.htm>
7. Barnaby, Frank, *Nuclear Connections*, paper presented at the Medical Association for Prevention of War Conference *Nuclear Terror; 60 years on*, Melbourne, August 2005.

ADOPTED 2005

First adopted at the 2005 Annual General Meeting of the Public Health Association of Australia held in Perth.