

Ian Norton is standing again for Launceston city council and he is suggesting landscape burning to minimize bushfires when there are other cleaner, smokeless methods available in this day and age.

Mr. Norton knows about toxicology according to his resume

<http://www.aldermaniannortoncv.blogspot.com/> so he should know that smoke from vegetation burnings is extremely toxic to all forms of life and can kill.

He is a snake man also and doesn't care much about them either; burn them and their habitat.

Why is he opposing the pulp mill? Obviously because Mr. Norton thinks it is going to pollute the air we breathe. If that is his reason then he should not be proposing to burn the landscape close to, or beyond, the Tamar valley when he is well aware of the known airshed problems in the area.

I would assume he voted previously to spend LCC ratepayer's money on the heater buy-back program to rid Launceston of harmful smoke and that our air quality readings around the state look like they won't meet new NEPM standards?

Obviously the doctor that authorized Mr. Norton's election material (Dr. R. Andrew of Lilydale) is not a medical doctor, otherwise he would know the health dangers of forced smoke inhalation.