



# Asbestos Council of Victoria



**Office:**  
41 Monash Road  
Newborough, Vic. 3825

**Postal Address:**  
ACV/GARDS INC.  
P.O. Box 111  
Moe, Vic. 3825

Ph: 03 5127 7744 (24/7)  
Fax: 03 5126 0354  
Email: [info@gards.org](mailto:info@gards.org)  
Web: [www.gards.org](http://www.gards.org)  
ABN: 77 687 118 554  
Inc. # A0042386U

26<sup>th</sup> January 2019

The Hon. Josh Frydenberg MP  
Treasurer  
The Treasury  
Langton Crescent  
PARKES ACT 2600  
AUSTRALIA  
[department@treasury.gov.au](mailto:department@treasury.gov.au)

Dear Hon. Minister Frydenberg

## 2019-20 Pre-Budget Submission

Our organisation is contacting you to highlight a very worthy Agency, the Asbestos Safety and Eradication Agency (ASEA) that needs to have its funding increased to meet the demand of the issues in Australia it is facing into the future.

A bit of information on us, The Asbestos Council of Victoria/GARDS Inc. (ACV/GARDS) was established in 1991 to support asbestos sufferers in Gippsland and throughout Victoria. We are the largest asbestos support and advocacy group in Victoria.

While ACV/GARDS has operated across Victoria, our focus of physical support has been in the Gippsland area. Gippsland has been affected by asbestos more than any other area in Victoria. The Victorian State Government conducted an epidemiology study of Latrobe Valley in 2003 and found the area had seven times the state average for mesothelioma and for every mesothelioma there were more than four asbestos related lung cancers and 10 other asbestos related diseases. This was mostly due to the power industry. The consistent public health research is to the effect that we have not yet reached the peak incidence of mesothelioma, and that exposures to asbestos which will lead to that cancer continue, with insufficient public awareness of risks associated with asbestos products or precautions that need to be taken to prevent the risk of disease.

ACV/GARDS believes that the Asbestos Safety and Eradication Agency (ASEA) has played an important role in promoting the dangers of asbestos and enacting public health initiatives in the period since its establishment with bipartisan support in 2013. ACV/GARDS believes that the role of ASEA should be expanded, with greater funding and policy influence provided to enable it to perform its stated objective of *“prevent exposure to asbestos fibres in order to eliminate asbestos-related disease in Australia.”*

ASEA was established with the intention of avoiding a scatter gun approach to asbestos where multiple agencies, often without the expertise or time to devote to the issue, were dealing with different aspects of asbestos management in Australia.

ACV/GARDS does not believe that ASEA performs any tasks or functions that would be more appropriately performed by other organisations. We believe you should be looking to extent the functions currently performed by ASEA, it seems counterproductive to duplicate activities performed by other organisations when ASEA was established to deal with asbestos issues in Australia. ASEA should be the preferred appropriate organisation to perform any such activities around asbestos. Further, where issues regarding asbestos are currently being dealt with by other agencies, ACV/GARDS submits these issues would more appropriately be dealt with by ASEA.

Generally, given ASEA is now well-established, ACV/GARDS believes that all asbestos issues should be co-ordinated by and through the Agency.

ACV/GARDS commends ASEA's focus and activities. Within its resource constraints ASEA has targeted its activities well. However, given the importance of its role, ACV/GARDS is concerned by the limited resources provided to ASEA. These resource constraints mean that ASEA has not done as much as it could have to achieve its targets.

A crucial recommendation by our organisation would be to increase funding and staffing to appropriate levels to enable the ASEA to deliver its statutory purpose.

ACV/GARDS believes that ASEA's unique strength is its singular focus on asbestos management. A further strength is the breadth of the stakeholders involved in its work. No other government (or non-government) agency has the dedicated infrastructure, knowledge or stakeholder relationships in relation to asbestos.

These strengths have meant that the Agency has become central to asbestos policy in Australia and has allowed it to develop expertise and relationships with key stakeholders. In a short time ASEA has established a reputation both nationally and internationally.

ACV/GARDS notes that these strengths are directly correlated to key achievements:

- its annual conference which brings together over 300 individuals representing support groups, Australian and international researchers, regulatory bodies, unions, industry groups, asbestos removalists and representatives of federal, state and local governments. There is no other organisation or entity that has a similar reach or breadth of relationships.
- new and important research in areas such as asbestos awareness (a yearly benchmark survey); the economic burden of asbestos disease; barriers to removing asbestos in the residential and commercial sector, and the impact of the asbestos legacy on indigenous communities.
- The establishment of stakeholder committees and working groups. ASEA has established four committees and working groups - Building, Construction and Demolition Sectors Committee, Technical Research Advisory Committee, Asbestos Waste Working Group and Asbestos Communications Working Group. Through these committees ASEA brings together relevant stakeholders to exchange information and inform on relevant issues.
- the Asbestos Safety Eradication Council (which advises the CEO and the Minister) which brings together representatives from State and Federal government, unions, industry groups and support groups and enables the sharing of information and consensus policy making.

As noted elsewhere, ACV/GARDS believes that weaknesses, and instances where ASEA has failed to fulfil its mandate or potential are caused by inadequate resourcing, and limits to its role imposed by legislation.

The longstanding failure of asbestos management in Australia arises from a lack of coordination, or allocation of responsibility for the development of asbestos management policy to any single agency or entity. ACV/GARDS believes ASEA is the best vehicle to address this issue.

ACV/GARDS believes that ASEA should not be limited to a co-ordination role but should be able to carry out its own research and projects that further its aim to prevent exposure to asbestos fibre in order to eliminate asbestos-related disease in Australia. Thus, saving the Australian government a great deal of money into the future in many ways.

ACV/GARDS believes that there is significant work that ASEA should be doing, that it has not been doing.

ACV/GARDS identifies three central issues relevant to why ASEA needs more funding and to fill gaps in the system:

1. A failure to ensure ASEA is the central and primary entity responsible for the development of programs and policy for asbestos management. This failure arises from limitations in the functions allocated to the ASEA under the Act, and from competition with other parts of government.

ACV/GARDS believes that a reason that Australia has failed to do enough to prevent future instances of asbestos disease is the lack of an effective single organisation empowered to oversee asbestos management.

ASEA should have control or input into all decisions of government involving asbestos.

2. Structural issues around the operation of ASEA including particularly the need to operate on a consensus basis. While stakeholder engagement and involvement are crucial, too great a reliance and focus on achieving consensus on matters can frustrate the critical work ASEA should do.
3. Inadequate funding and resourcing. Given the cost of asbestos disease to the community (both in dollars and human suffering) ACV/GARDS believes that significantly greater

investment is warranted. ACV/GARDS has observed a lack of resources as a significant reason for ASEA not achieving its full potential to date.

The National Strategic Plan for Asbestos Management and Awareness in Australia (the NSP) was developed by ASEA working with all state and territory governments. It represents the most substantial attempt at a national, co-ordinated response to the dangers posed by asbestos to our communities. While the need to operate in consultation with all stakeholders in developing the NSP is noted, ACV/GARDS believes that, given ASEA's expertise and focus, its role and responsibility should be promoted. ASEA should develop and implement the NSP. It is clearly the best positioned organisation to undertake this role, but it will need more funding and resources to do so.

The primary challenges facing asbestos management and awareness in Australia concern in situ asbestos cement building materials. The extent of these challenges is enormous. ACV/GARDS notes:

- Australia was the highest country consumer of asbestos per capita. More than 80% of homes built since the 1980's contains some fibre cement sheeting. For homes built before 1983 this sheeting contained asbestos. Very little of the sheeting (only a portion of the sheets manufactured between 1977 and 1983) contains a warning, or label that it contains asbestos. Fibre cement containing asbestos and asbestos free fibre cement are broadly indistinguishable. The fact that all the asbestos sheeting is now at least 30 years old means that, increasingly, the sheeting is in deteriorated condition, or will need to be replaced.
- Natural disasters including fires, major storms, floods and cyclones result in asbestos cement sheeting being damaged and expose rescue workers and the general public to the risk of contracting an asbestos disease from inhaling asbestos dust and fibre during the after math and clean up.
- Significant infrastructure (particularly water and sewerage pipes, and telecoms pits) are made of asbestos cement. The cost and occupational health and safety issues associated with this infrastructure is enormous.
- The incidence of mesothelioma has remained relatively constant for several years. As there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos dust below which there is no risk of developing mesothelioma, exposures to asbestos that will cause Australians to develop mesothelioma continue to occur.

While a focus on treatment for mesothelioma is important, ACV/GARDS notes the need to identify and remove asbestos is becoming increasingly urgent. Given the age of the sheeting, it is likely to be replaced soon. There is an urgent need to ensure this is done in a cost effective, methodical and safe manner. Further there is a need to avoid costly haphazard issues arising after natural disasters.

A national targeted approach is essential. Education and awareness need to be increased and targeted to tradies, DIYs, general community, local government and anyone else that deals with asbestos or makes decisions around asbestos. Mapping of asbestos disposal sites, creating new disposal sites and making sure that those sites are specifically targeted in areas where there will be known removal into the future. Old asbestos disposal sites should be investigated and mapped so that they are they are not disturbed into the future. There needs to be a greater emphasis on addressing all the issues around importation of asbestos and greater effort in prosecutions with large penalties for offenders. Penalties should also include removal of illegal asbestos by the developer and the importer. So many issues and a limited budget make it very clear it is hamstrung by inadequate funding and resources.

ACV/GARDS believes that ASEA should be at the policy and action centre of facing challenges. At the moment those shared responsibilities across levels of government and different departments has not worked

ACV/GARDS supports ASEA being promoted as the central entity responsible for the oversight of asbestos management. To this end (and without limiting other functions) ASEA Agency should:

- have a proactive role in developing asbestos management policy;
- implement asbestos management policy;
- have the ability to recommend to the relevant agency that they prosecute businesses or individuals who ignore the asbestos regulations across Australia
- undertake carry out its own research and programmes.

So, we believe Legislation needs to give ASEA a proactive role in advising and carrying out the government's asbestos policy. ASEA needs to be able to carry out its own research and programmes. It needs to be able to partner with other bodies. It should also be the body responsible for all legislation relating to asbestos and recommending the prosecution of businesses or individuals who illegally import asbestos.

So, to this end we are asking the Federal Treasurer to carefully consider increasing the funding to ASEA so that it can carry out the important work that it was created to do. So that Australia can carry out and face some of its biggest issues it is facing around asbestos management and disease. ACV/GARDS believes that increasing the funding to ASEA will in the years to come not only benefit all Australians by decreasing asbestos disease, which might we say is at this present time approx. 4000 Australians dying from asbestos related disease each year. The agency will reduce the burden on the medical system and save lives into the future while eradicating asbestos from the environment before disasters such as bush fires and floods and any other catastrophes become a source for immediate concern.

If you would like to contact us about anything in this submission please feel free to do so at any time we would be more than happy to discuss any of this submission with you and enlighten you more to what the asbestos issues are for this country and how important it is that the funding to the Agency increases.

Submission compiled by:

Vicki Hamilton OAM  
CEO/Secretary  
Asbestos Council of Victoria/GARDS Inc.  
26<sup>th</sup> January 2019  
[vicki@gards.org](mailto:vicki@gards.org)

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Vicki Hamilton". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.