

Submission Cover Sheet

Review of the Moratorium on GM Canola

Submission Number: 135

Name of Individual/Organisation: Australian Institute of Self Development

Date Received: 7 August 2007

Number of Pages: 2

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

Please Extend the commercial GM canola ban indefinitely, Because;

1. This will allow Australia to maintain a competitive advantage in the world market and continue to attract premium prices up to A\$120/tonne for GM-free canola (ABARE, 2007);
2. Staying GM free will reduce testing, segregation and shipping costs.
3. Staying GM free will maintain shopper confidence in Australian foods. Global concerns about GM foods and crops are increasing.
4. No other GM crops being researched could be available in the next five years. Promises of healthier foods, drought and salt tolerant crops, longer shelf life food, etc. are just hopeful promises (Glover 2005, in Corish 2005).
5. The RIRDC report on GM canola by Anderson and Jackson says:

"Hence net economic welfare for Australia would be US\$28 million per year higher as a result of GM adoption, less any negative value domestic consumers place on not knowing if they may be consuming GM products. With the EU moratorium, the net economic welfare benefit to Australian producers and consumers of GM adoption in this case is estimated to be US\$15 million per year. While that is \$13 million less than if there is no EU moratorium, it still represents a net gain from joining the adopters of GM varieties of these four crops even if the EU moratorium remains in place. However, the average Australian farm household income would decrease with GM adoption - even with rice and wheat included - if the EU moratorium remains. ... Even then, several States of Australia have continued to delay approval because they perceive insufficient economic benefit from GM crops to warrant the cost of the necessary co-existence system (which will fall more on non-GM producers, the smaller the share of GM varieties in total output) and the expected loss that would result from a downgrading of their status as a 'clean, green, safe food' supplier domestically and abroad."

Thankyou Russell Cunningham

Russell & Verena Cunningham
Australian Institute of Self Development
(03) 97 222 678

info@selfdevelopment.com.au
www.selfdevelopment.com.au