

References

Janet's suggestions for submissions to the
Review of the Genetically Modified Crops Free Areas Act 2003

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this review.

I firmly believe that the Act must be retained for the following reasons

(Use these dot points to create sentences to frame your own submission. Do not send as a list.)

Dot Points

- Act put in place to give state control re what GM crops can grow and where
- Commonwealth should not dictate these decisions to state
- State maintains control over what GM crops can/cannot grow
- State maintains control over where GM crops can/cannot grow
- Needs of state are unique to WA (reputation, economy)
- State should assess each crop individually on markets/marketability
- Process of assessment must be transparent
- Assessment must include all stakeholders/sectors of community and not restricted to one sector
- Exemptions based on markets/marketability should be verified/open to public review
- Markets /marketability be soundly based on effective segregation to supply all choices (GM/GM free)
- Exemptions to allow GM free shires to exist as functioning entities

Concerns

- **Are there markets for GM?**
- **Locally** – growing consumer opposition
- 90% consumers want transparent GM labelling
- No consumer demand for GM
- Increase in demand for organics
- At least twenty shires declared GM free
- **Nationally** – growing consumer opposition
- Support for GM free from industry (Goodman Fielder, Unilever)
- Support for GM free from supermarkets (Coles, IGA)
- Support for GM free from producers (non GM/ GM free labelling /actively avoiding GM ingredients in products)
- **Internationally** – growing consumer opposition
- Mandatory GM labelling in EU (WA –™s largest canola buyer)
- GM Labelling in EU soon to cover GM fed animal products
- Growing number of countries/regions declared GM free zones
- No obvious demand for GM crops/food from markets/consumers
- Should GM canola become a commercial industry in WA these markets could become unviable.
- **Can Segregation work?**
- CBH and other grains stakeholders have admitted that contamination will occur

- "tolerance level"™ introduced to allow for contamination
- Segregation protocols provide "pathway to market"™ for GM
- No guarantees of GM free supplies to markets/consumers
- Non GM farmers face risks of contamination
- Seed suppliers cannot guarantee GM free seed
- Contamination occurs in seed stock, in field, during harvesting, storage, human error
- Non GM farmers face costs for seed testing throughout supply chain
- Additional costs for segregation up to 9% more
- Markets/consumers could face higher prices for unwanted product
- To date best GM canola seeds cost 15% more but yield 10% less than best conventional

Yours sincerely,

Name

PLEASE NOTE

Submissions should be no longer than 10 single-sided pages. A submission which is not legible or has a font size of less than 11 pt will not be considered. All submissions, including the name and address of the submitting person/organisation will be placed on the Department of Agriculture and Food's™ website for public information.

Submissions are required by close of business on 14 August 2009. Email submissions are preferred to the gmcropsreview@agric.wa.gov.au mailbox.

Alternatively, send hard copy submissions to:
 Genetically Modified Crops Free Areas Act Review
 Department of Agriculture and Food
 Locked Bag 4
 Bentley Delivery Centre WA 6983