

Sharon Hall
Submission No 9194

Hi Everyone, To introduce myself, I am from no organization, I am a very concerned New Zealander, and parent. I am not a hunter, neither is my husband.

I put in a submission because I think it is a big shame that New Zealand, our beautiful natural country and its animals, and ecosystem is being poisoned continually, by 1080.

I read in an article that unless lots of scientific evidence is provided by the submitters, that there is a high chance that 1080 will be out there for full use. Also in local newspapers that by an initial look it is looking like it is all fine to go through. This is not a good thing to be in papers, and in articles before hearings, it makes you wonder who is saying these things. Apparently the decision is meant to be released in July 07 not pre-hearings.

I am not sure if the scientific evidence will be available in NZ, due to the problem that the people who should be doing the research are heavily involved with the applicants. And I would not think they would want scientific evidence of things they don't want to happen. Mr Mead I think is an example of what I am talking about.

Water tests done by landcare research. Scientific Research and Aerial Possum Control, A cost benefit study, prepared by lots of NZ Companies who stand to gain financially from 1080 being used. Ie: They are part of the distribution process, or are a pest company, or a pesticide company. You don't have to be a scientist to figure out which way their research will sway. Lots of the submissions for 1080 are from companies who use it, sell it, distribute it, apply it, or are part of government structures, councils etc, health board, all these people of course are going to be pro it, if they didn't they would probably loose their jobs.

I am not a hunter, or are particularly keen on the process, and I think some aspects of hunting are not fair to animals, but overall, I believe the hunters are the ones telling the true unbiased story of what is really happening in the bush. For most of them they are everyday New Zealanders, and it their hobby, some their livelihood, but they are self employed, and don't have to risk loosing their career if they say what they really think.

When the committee is making their decision I think this needs to be taken into big consideration. Who is telling the truth, to me it is blantly obvious. Saying that the poison isn't causing that much harm to the birds and ecosystem, and that it recovers after the possums are removed, I am sure the possums recover just as fast or not faster than the birds, it makes commonsense.

My main points really all come back to research; As that is what is what is wanted, I am not a scientist, but it makes a lot of sense that the research needs to be not from New Zealand Companies who support the objects of doc, and ahb, or who are against them, but very independent, and unbiased for it to be honest for a start.

I submit that there is overwhelming evidence overseas that states 1080 is inhumane, cruel, slow deaths, sub-lethal doses being used, targets everything, effects everything, is one of the most toxic substances known to man.

There is lots of human evidence about the cruelty that has been witnessed on pets, deer, possums and other creatures of this world. Cruelty is Cruelty, it is not dependant on whether you are native or not. The possum is native to Australia, it is rare protected species in New York, it is decling in numbers in Australia, due to loss of habitat. It may one day be a rare endangered species. Any way the point is whether doc or ahb thinks a creature is a pest or not it should be treated humanely.

If I was a regular bush goer in New Zealand I would be very worried after reading the horror stories of things that are happening. Our forests are a great asset to our country and we need them, we need insects, we need plants, we don't need our ecosystem poisoned by some cheap and nasty poisoning programme.

Aerial poisoning should never have been allowed in the first place, and I really hope it stops. Before our whole country is ruined.

I think there is overwhelming international research by many countries telling us that 1080 is dangerous, cruel, environmentally a big problem. Apparently USA banned it because of its cruelty, and for environmental reasons. Tasmania is now having similar problems.

Obviously money is the factor of why it is being used its cheap, but what is important here, How will the rest of the world look at us. Our food chain is being polluted. Our health will be compromised. Our country is at a huge risk, for the sake of having a cheap poison. It will cost New Zealand and New Zealanders in the long run.

You don't have to be a scientist, just have common sense to see what pesticides, insecticides, and all the other chemical rubbish is doing to nature, and peoples and animals health in general.

I have noticed from doing my own tiny bit of research that there is possible problems for fertility for creatures large and small exposed to 1080. This has extreme implications for the future of our species.

In reading the information on the research involving Maori, it was substandard, they weren't given an unbiased picture, nor time, nor good opportunities to come to meetings, turn out was poor apparently, but there was reasons for that. Dates and times of meetings etc...

Again this is supportive to the applicants. They would probably if given time and different access to information be a force to be reckoned with.

Final words look at overseas, and unbiased research. The government doesn't always get it right look at history. Take care this is a hugely important decision for all of New Zealand from the soil to the insects to the animals to us humans now and in the future.