

Submission Cover Sheet

Review of the Moratorium on GM Canola

Submission Number: 250

Name of Individual/Organisation: Vincent Kelly

Date Received: 20 August 2007

Number of Pages: 1

Attachments Submitted with this Submission:

To obtain copies of these attachments please call the Review Panel Secretariat on
(03) 9658 4874 or (03) 9658 4871

Dear Sir/Madam,
RE: GM Crops Review

I believe the three questions we must ask ourselves are:

1. What is the meaning of the term GM crops?
2. Who stands to gain and lose from the moratorium?
3. Is the moratorium on GM crops in Victoria in the State interest or for the common good?

1. I believe the meaning of GM crop means a crop whereby the genetics of a crop variety has been modified through the **breeding process** by crossing, selection, back crossing or laboratory implantation.

2. I believe the people who stand to gain from ending the moratorium (ban) are those who **control the breeding process**. These people will control the seed market, the production and marketing of these GM crop varieties. Much of this breeding process is funded from public research monies via the GRDC to which growers and governments pay levies. Also the RIRDC monies (public monies). There is also private investment in this breeding. Some of these breeding companies are divisions of government departments ie. the DPI and Agriculture Departments, both State and Federal. Most of these GM varieties will have protection under PBR legislation.

3. Is it in the public interest that private companies will control large sections of the food chain after using public monies? Of course there are advantages with GM crops like disease, production and quality levels which can be of benefit to the community. Do the advantages to the community of a ban on GM crops outweigh the disadvantages? At this stage I believe the moratorium on GM crops in Victoria should remain until it can be clearly demonstrated that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

I would like to use an example that was recently given much publicity in the National Geographic in January regarding the production and marketing of GM soy beans in Brazil. In the article it stated that Cargill controlled the majority of the soy bean market and production in that country. Large areas of the Amazon Rainforest were destroyed to produce GM soybeans, some of which were crushed into soybean meal and ended up in Australia. The question I asked myself was "Is this an ethical process?" Another Question I asked myself was "Will GM crops deliver more choices to growers and consumers without too many conditions imposed by the owner of the variety?" At this stage I believe the answer to this is no, because there will be too much control delivered to a few GM crop owners without enough benefits to the community and undertakings by the GM crop owners to the community. Public research monies must remain with public varieties.

I've tried to keep this as brief as possible and sorry if you think I've simplified the matter.

Yours Sincerely
Vincent Kelly