

1. Beekeeping has seen a resurgence across the world. In my local Association our membership has seen a 500% increase over the past 12 months. This paper ignores the research demonstrating the impact of glyphosate on our key pollinators, European Honeybees, and also fails to acknowledge that consumers can now test for glyphosate in honey. Continuing to use glyphosate impacts bees and creates serious brand damage for the beekeeping industry - what message do you have for beekeepers concerned about the continued use by contractors/governments of glyphosate on roadsides, gardens, parks and on farms?

2. The APVMA makes a weight-of-evidence assessment when approving chemicals. in 2017-18, leading up to the Dewayne Johnson litigation case in the United States, the Monsanto Papers were released - 188 pages of damning evidence demonstrating that Monsanto sponsored ghostwriting of articles published in toxicology journals and lay media, interfered in the peer review process, behind-the-scenes influence on retraction and the creation of an 'academic' website as a front for the defense of the Monsanto product. This weight-of-evidence 'research' was used to greenlight the use of glyphosate in Australia and all levels of government use the APVMA as a cover to continue using this product. Anyone who is tracking the APVMA can see they have been carefully positioning to remove any liability regarding the use of glyphosate - they are passing this onto 'someone.' How do contractors and councils feel about being 'someone' and being positioned to explain to ratepayers, who have no say in the decisions made, that they will ultimately be liable for this product? Also, Bush regenerative businesses will be held liable for their staff becoming unwell in the future because you are contractors and not council staff.

3. This presentation includes the 'politics of glyphosate' in its title. Submission 108 to the independence of regulatory decisions made by the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) in 2019 highlights concerns about APVMA's conflicts of interest and lack of independence. Around 86% of APVMA's ca \$40 million annual budget is paid by the companies that produce and market registered toxins. Half of the APVMA's \$33 million annual budget to assess and register chemicals is funded by the companies that manufacture and market the toxins designed to kill plants, fungi, insects, animals, microbes and more. Are Councils, contract managers and bush regenerators aware of this perceived/real conflict of interest and what is being done to address this directly with the regulator?

4. A final comment, I also note the users of glyphosate in the images of this report are non-compliant with the SDS for use of this product.

Jenni McLeod
The Bee Collective



FROM the backyards of
tasmanian beekeepers

Ph 0448 515 867
beecollectivetas@gmail.com

