

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Agriculture and Environment Committee](#)
Subject: Submission to Hendra Inquiry
Date: Monday, 2 May 2016 11:31:10 PM

Dear Sir,

Please accept this email as a submission to the Inquiry, Terms Of Reference items 2 and 3.

The incidence and impact of adverse reactions by horses following vaccination and the reporting of adverse reactions and economic impacts of the Hendra vaccine.

One of our 3 horses had an adverse reaction after each of the last 2 boosters. Our vet would not attend if we did not pay the call out fee for an inspection and confirmation. Both adverse reactions were reported by phone to APVMA, and confirmation letters received. One of the reactions was within the Permit stage, and in my opinion, should have been costed into the vaccine permit period as a chargeback cost to the permit holder. We did not ask our horse to react, we did not ask our vet to administer any treatment that might cause a reaction, we were never advised of the possibility of an adverse reaction, we were never offered any advice to label information. We were never advised the vaccine was in a permit stage and was not compulsory. We trusted our vet implicitly. He is an educated person and we are pensioners with a commitment to our 3 rescue horses. The vet wins, and will be supported by the Permit holder in any discussion. We lose.

Who bears the risks of HeV infection and who incurs the costs and receives the benefits from each risk mitigation option.

We now have a situation which may or may not fall into this term, but is the result of booster program designed by our vet. On april 6th 2016, I wrote a letter to our vet, saying thank you for your reminder notice to revaccinate our horses in late April, and asked the vet to please advise why our horses received 3 boosters in the last 12 months, when the booster requirement is 6 monthly. The vet gave them an extra booster without advising us, at the same time as 2 in 1 and dental injections..total 4 injections on the one day, the hendra booster accounting for \$327. He mentioned to us at the time that he thought it a good idea to bring all annual injections and treatments together to save us call out fees. To date no reply has been received, and we have delayed this submission till the very last moment. So we now have this situation. Our vet gave our horses a treatment we did not order, and we are out of pocket \$327. Our vet did not advise us of his treatment plan, so any input from us as horse owners was removed. We were denied reaction inspections unless we paid. One horses reaction has cost more than \$2000. By assuming we would continue to use the same vet practice for all treatments, our choice of vet has been removed, i.e. the vet made the assumption we would always use them to do our dental

work, so has taken away our freedom of choice. I'm fairly sure that is not a legal practice in any consumer category. We are now without a vet even though our horses are Hendra vaccinated. We have now booked another equine dental specialist to do our horses annual work, so there goes our represented call out saving. We now have to find another vet to attend our horses.

We are not sure where our submission will fit into your terms of reference, but we feel we have borne the risks and costs of the Hendra program, and when we ask for the facts, we lose our rights as well.

Dennis and Lin Richardson
Mareeba, QLD