

AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY CHEMICALS LEGISLATION
AMENDMENT BILL 2012

The Government & Council of Australia have a duty of care to its people to protect them from the "MISUSE" of any substance known to be harmful to health.

They have also that same duty of care of protection from harm from the "USE" of a product when there is reasonable known cause of harm and when there is known possible cause of harm to health.

Failure to implement this moral & legal duty of care to its citizens, & instead favour the growth of an economy by promoting chemical industry, is a travesty of our democracy when the scientific evidence of harm is unmitigated.

My submission to you relates to the blatant disregard, despite prior knowledge (both verbal & written) of the lily of Stirling to my health & to my civil rights.

I have an extremely rare & disabling condition inoperably worsened by exposure to chemicals including all pesticides/herbicides. My medical reports are available by request.

In 2011 I applied for & was granted an exclusion zone to help lessen my adverse reactions. This was ignored.

In 2012 I was again granted an exclusion zone & also a commitment from Council to notify me by telephone just prior to commencement of spraying, in all areas of my suburb, to enable me to take mitigating measures to safeguard my health.

Council failed in both their commitments on three occasions - 21st May, 12th July, 19th September, resulting in serious deterioration to my health & subsequent hospitalisation.

I have now a third commitment to notify me immediately prior to spraying - voiced at 27 November Council meeting.

I was granted on 12 October an exclusion zone of 200m given "due to your specific health requirements & your neighbour's request to be on the 'no spray' list. I believe I can justify this arrangement to all nearby residents because of potential spray drift...." The neighbour being a Catholic Church.

Correspondence received 1 November states my 200m exclusion zone is now being reviewed as the distance is too arbitrary, too difficult & "evidence on the harm of pesticides in general is still inconclusive."

- This, despite the reasons for the exclusion zone of 200m being granted remaining unchanged.
- "inconclusive" evidence is conclusive evidence in many other countries where 41 pesticides (including Glyphosate) in use

here, are banned.

- "inconclusive" is "reasonable doubt", & each & every Council is autonomous & responsible for making its own decisions & those decisions must be made in the best interests of their residents & rate payers, & when residents, & rate payers' health & well-being is adversely affected by that Council's decisions they must be held accountable.

I will not permit the City of Stirling to destroy what remains of my health because of decisions based on "inconclusive evidence & technicalities."

3) the amendment in this Bill leads to more widespread use of more chemicals, how can the Bill possibly protect me & the many other vulnerable people in the community?

The result is very obviously going to be the exact opposite of Bill's claim of having "to manage the risks to the health & safety of human beings"

Barbara Smart