

Submission Cover Sheet

Review of the Moratorium on GM Canola

Submission Number: 175

Name of Individual/Organisation: David Llewlyn MHA – Minister for Primary Industries and Water

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



Tasmania

Department of
Primary Industries

20 AUG 2007

MAIL SERVICE CENTRE

MINISTER for PRIMARY
INDUSTRIES and WATER

16 AUG 2007

Submission 175

RECEIVED
R [initials] D

GM Canola Review Panel Secretariat
Department of Primary Industries
Level 19, 1 Spring Street
GPO Box 4440
Melbourne VIC 3001

Dear Panel

**Review of the moratorium on commercial cultivation of genetically modified canola in
Victoria**

I wish to make comment against the terms of reference concerning whether the Victorian Government should allow the moratorium to expire or be extended, and complimentary policies and practices required to address the consequences of the moratorium ending.

I raise segregation of GM canola from non-GM canola and other non-GM grains as a critical issue that ought to be considered fully before a decision to abandon the Victorian moratorium is made. None of the publications or other information I have viewed on this matter inspire confidence in the ability or willingness of industry to ensure an adequate standard of identity preservation, either for markets accepting tolerances or those that demand freedom from GM material. I am also yet to be convinced there are effective mechanisms for oversight of segregation systems.

As an example, Tasmania detected GM material in a 60 tonne consignment of non-GM feed canola from Victoria in 2006. We rejected the shipment in line with current policy and reported it in various relevant fora. Our reports generated limited interest, there has been no attempt to follow up so far as I am aware and hence no explanation is available. If the possibility of sabotage is discounted, this incident, occurring as it did at a time when commercial cultivation of GM canola is prohibited around the country, demonstrates the real difficulty of keeping GM material out of conventional stocks and the lack of integrity in current segregation practices.

I recommend strongly that you accept that development and implementation of robust policies and practices for segregation are necessary prior to cessation of the current ban on commercial cultivation of GM canola in Victoria.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely

David Llewellyn MHA
MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND WATER