

From: Tony Ryan
To: [fracking inquiry](#)
Subject: Re: Consultation
Date: Tuesday, 14 March 2017 4:04:19 PM

Many thanks, and yes, I have read all the information presented on your site. It makes for excellent reading and covers an impressive array of concerns.

However, may I take this opportunity to express some apprehension about the implied objectivity of the multiple studies...

Since academia and science were corporatised following the Hawke/Keating era free trade initiatives, which intensified seamlessly under Howard et al, I have discovered numerous instances of 'science' being used by industry as both a PR tool and as ammunition for lobbying. In one instance, and of particular relevance here, I witnessed on video, Queensland government scientists measuring water toxicity using instruments that were decalibrated; and upon their departure for the site, properly calibrated instruments applied showing significant toxicity. Hundreds of Territorians viewed the same evidence.

- More broadly, I have witnessed government scientists deliberately smothering information about the presence of heavy metals in fertiliser produced by the so-called 'reverse osmosis' method of creating drinking water from sewerage; a process tht has nothing to do with osmosis and is simply a high pressure filtration mechanism which is horrifically distant from fail-safe status.**
- I have observed dozens of scientists standing by tightlipped as SBS and ABCTV and other media present the central Pacific Kiribati Island as being engulfed by AGW-generated rising seas; and not a word, in a dozen years of this nonsense, about the islands 400 year known history of sinking. Is this not clear evidence of politics overriding science? and abrogation of the scientific commitment to proselytising fact over fiction?**
- In agronomy in the NT, I have witnessed several events in which noxious weeds were let loose as pastoral experiments, or were otherwise permitted to irretrievably colonise (ie Mimosa Pigra on the Marakai Plains).**
- Then there was the PhD (then) ANPWS ranger who introduced the European honey bee into Kakadu, without first launching an environmental impact study (which would have failed abysmally), and who defended his action with a plaintive "but honey is good".**

I could rattle on for hours about the 'science' I have observed during the past four decades that is neither objective, intelligent, nor regulated by appropriate integrity.

What I am saying here is that your entire moratorium-terminating study in no way acknowledges the collapse in public confidence in science today. Ergo, just because assertion is made by a qualified scientists, this in no way guarantees that the outcome will be actual science.

There is another disturbing aspect of your study... it does not acknowledge that Australia belongs to we, the people of Australia. To quote Lord Acton and Thomas Paine, *all authority resides in the people*. NT surveys thus far demonstrate that 98% of survey participants are opposed to fracking of any kind. They see foreign exploitation of a risky resource, and few measurable benefits for the people of Australia. On Aboriginal land, they see risk that militates against any possible local benefits.

Finally, as one who was then, progressively, both a Commonwealth and NT Government

employee, I personally observed negotiations over Ranger, and there was the clear understanding that Aborigines had the power to say no to that mining. Media versions of Yolngu land use authority have clearly dropped this concept in favour of generic Australian mining laws (versus pastoralists). Is this the Rupert Murdoch factor? or has the Land Rights Act (76) been overturned?

As you can see, we don't have an awful lot of joint overlapping perspective here. Your studies entirely ignore a body of skepticism that infects at least half the national electorate. (ref my surveys of 2001, 2003, 2007, and 2010).

I readily appreciate that it is not your collective brief to consider my misgivings, but the cold reality is that what I feel is shared by most rural Territorians. When I have launched a contextualising website, I suspect that the urban NT will drift quite quickly in the same direction.

You really need to address this evident reality, or overtly reject it.

Perhaps i should qualify this document with the proviso that I am not locked into an attitude on the subject of shale fracking, or on any other issue for that matter. Show me convincing evidence and I will lean towards what is good for Territorians. However, you *are* up against the proved lies and deceptions of Santo and other miners.

Kindest regards

**Tony Hayward-Ryan
Nhulunbuy**

On Sat, Mar 11, 2017 at 9:42 AM, fracking inquiry <fracking.inquiry@nt.gov.au> wrote:

Dear Mr Ryan

Thank you for your email.

Please note that the Inquiry has released a Background and Issues Paper, which can be found [here](#). You have an opportunity to provide feedback on the paper either online or at upcoming regional community meetings. The Inquiry will have information available in language at these regional community meetings.

Further information about the community meetings can be found [here](#).

Regards

Hydraulic Fracturing Inquiry

e ... fracking.inquiry@nt.gov.au

w ... <https://frackinginquiry.nt.gov.au/>

THE SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY INTO
HYDRAULIC FRACTURING
IN THE NORTHERN TERRITORY



Confidentiality and Disclaimer Statement:

Use or transmittal of the information in this email other than for authorised NT Government business purposes may constitute misconduct under the **NT Public Sector Code of Conduct** and could potentially be an offence under the **NT Criminal Code**. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or any attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this document in error, please advise the sender. No representation is given that attached files are free from viruses or other defects. Scanning for viruses is recommended.

From: Tony Ryan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 21 December 2016 11:36 AM
To: fracking inquiry
Subject: Consultation

I note that Aboriginal consultation protocols have been entirely ignored when it comes to approaches to Arnhem language groups. The NLC has always been comfortable with this as it enhances that organisations power, but articulate and well-informed Aborigines are now appreciating how they are being manipulated, and are now moving towards alternative forums for dialogue.

I also note that the ALP fully intends to support fracking and other dubious ventures in the NT, once the inconvenience of moratoriums and pseudo-consultation processes have been swept aside.

Walker's actions following electoral defeat have exposed the ALP's duplicity to Yolngu and it is unlikely they will be fooled again.

So good luck with this.

Kindest regards

Tony Hayward-Ryan

(Inaugural member of *Young Labour* and original architect of the ALP capture of six seats in the mid-1970s).