

**Page 31 Mr Buffier stated:**

"The only person who does not agree with us, it would appear, is Mr Andrew Helps. Mr Andrew Helps, to the best of my knowledge—I have not been able to find this out—has no qualifications, has never published in a professional journal and has a business model that relies on recovery of mercury as a business operation".

**Answer.**

Once again, Mr Buffier is misleading Parliament. Mr Buffier has never bothered to speak to me let alone to have requested a copy of my CV which clearly refutes his scurrilous claim. However, I would be very happy to provide him with a copy but because of my sworn confidentiality to my overseas government clients, it would first be necessary for Mr Buffier to provide evidence of an adequate level of security clearance that is acceptable to my overseas Government clients, or if not, or if he is unwilling to do so, then the sensitive parts of my CV would, of necessity, be redacted from it. Some of my Asian clients would be very nervous if they knew that a person who has a demonstrated tendency to mislead a State Parliament under oath had access to their confidential environmental management information.

Regarding Buffier's comment 'having never published in a professional journal'; it might surprise Mr Buffier to learn that in fact one of my scientists, Ian Brown our Technical Director at the time, wrote the paper, 'Maternal transfer of mercury to the developing embryo/fetus: is there a safe level?', which was peer reviewed and published in the UK Journal of Toxicological & Environmental Chemistry, viz., Vol. 94, No 8, September 2012, 1610-1627. Mr Brown's coauthor in this paper was Associate Professor David Austin, an avid publisher of papers on mercury impacts to humans, and especially children, who at that time headed up the 'Brain & Psychological Sciences Research Center, Swinburne Autism Bio-Research Initiative, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Vic.'. This paper put forward the world-first concept of 'viewing mercury impacts from the perspective of the embryo/fetus rather than the currently accepted point of viewing impacts to an embryo/fetus from a 60-65 kg female's perspective'.

It is interesting to note that this peer reviewed paper is also widely referenced in the political debate on mercury preservatives in Vaccines in the USA.

Mr Buffier only seems to be fascinated with scientists! I am an Environmental Disaster Manager not a scientist, a role I have successfully performed since 1966. The scientists work for me, not the other way around.

Hg Recoveries P/L was formed in 2010 at the request of the Federal Government to federally permit and establish the first project in Australia to recover mercury from a historical gold mining area using the skills I had developed over the previous 20 years during similar projects in Asia. This Victorian project was to provide the basic data to inform the ratification by the Federal Parliament of what is now known as the Minamata Convention.

Hg Recoveries is actively involved in the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership, is a participant in the peer review of UNEP Global Mercury Partnership documents in its five core skill areas, and I will be a panelist for the SETAC (Society Of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry) Mercury Science and Policy Symposium in Kumamoto Japan in October 2013. This symposium gathers 15 distinguished scientists and industry practitioners to assess the state of science regarding the various goals and management areas cited within the Minamata convention.

It is interesting to note that neither of two experts, Prof Alison Jones and Prof Wayne Smith, quoted to Parliament in the previous answer by Mr Buffier have been invited to be panelists at this symposium.

It would have been more helpful to the Parliament if Mr Buffier had chosen to call me first and had obtained or determined this information first, prior to him making the grave mistake of providing the NSW Parliament with deceptive and misleading information.