

From: Wilson Tuckey

Subject: Submission to the Inquiry into mechanisms for compensation for economic loss to farmers in Western Australia caused by contamination by genetically modified material

Date: 6 February 2018 4:51:24 pm AWST

To: toenv@parliament.wa.gov.au

The Chairman Please find below my objection and reasons to the underlying intention of this Inquiry which it appears is designed to override the outcome of a Court case which addressed the legal issues relating to this matter and consequently raises the the issue of the Constitutional Separation of Powers because as I recollect the case revolved around the fact that the plaintiff complained that by the alleged cross pollination of his crop that he had lost certification from a SELF ACCREDITED NGO which had no legislative standing under the International Standards Association The letters NGO stands for NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION and leads immediately to the question does your Committee of Members of Parliament subscribe to this form of organisation running State Government Policy

Having observed the growth of these self appointed bodies as Federal Forestry Minister I implemented the process of creating an Australian Forestry Standard which is a timely and complex process requiring amongst other matters that ALL interest groups be involved and your Committee might be surprised to know that originally the green NGO movement refused the invitation of the Federal Parliament to Participate as it saw it as a competitor to another NGO labelled the Forestry Standards Association (FSC)( which in later years was given \$500,000 taxpayer dollars to become accredited but I have seen no such evidence) and only did so when I promised to publicise this hypocrisy and the evidence to be found in a novel labelled Green Gold which I recommend should be obtained and included in evidence for your deliberation in terms of the integrity of certain NGO's when they operate to their own rules in areas of certification

The conclusion of this process was not completed until some years after I had left that Ministry but exists today and has International Standing

Put simply therefore your Committee must first decide the precedent and the Standard which might be breached to warrant compensation and in this respect will you recommend the development of an International Standard for Cropping or some form of Rafferty's rules?

If it is your intention to move in the direction of protecting Human Health might I point out that past rhetoric that made the case for banning the consumption of such Genetically manipulated crops such as labelling them 'Frankenstein Food' have been largely disproven by the extensive adoption of so called Genetic Engineering OF THE HUMAN BODY and its reproductive processes in the pursuit of disease cures and the prevention of embryo abnormalities

Considering therefore that there is still no Standards Association body upon which to define an offence requiring Compensation and this issue thus relates to a matter of Commerce the question arises just how far would your Inquiry's recommendations extend and or what precedents will be then established in unrelated areas Does any modern day technological initiative that gives one business an advantage over a competitor warrant compensation to the loser?

ABOVE ALL AND CONSIDERING THE SIZE OF MOST CONTEMPORARY GRAIN GROWING PROPERTIES SURELY THE DUTY OF CARE NOT TO PLANT VULNERABLE CROPS ADJOINING A NEIGHBOURS FENCE LINE RESIDES WITH THE FARMER WHO CHOOSES TO GROW SUCH SPECIES NOT THE FARMER WHO IS JUST MINDING HIS OWN AFFAIRS AND PLANTING A LEGAL CROP

Please accept this lodgement as approval to publish its contents and I would appreciate your acknowledgement of its receipt

Hon. Wilson Tuckey

**From:**  
**To:** [Environment and Public Affairs Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Addition to my submission genetic compensation  
**Date:** Wednesday, 14 February 2018 10:02:52 AM

---

The Chairman for Inquiry into mechanisms for compensation for economic loss to farmers in Western Australia caused by contamination by genetically contaminated material

Further to my email submission of the 6th or 7th of February 2018 I wish to draw the attention and submit as evidence of an article to be found on pages 17 and 26 of today's Australian newspaper reporting on approvals for a Nufarm genetically modified Canola crop by insertion of a gene from "sea algae" creating an high Omega 3 concentration oil which it is predicted will return an estimated US\$2300 per tonne compared to US\$850 available from a standard crop. Considering the Public Health benefits also arising and the broad terms of reference for this inquiry the question must arise to whom would you recommend the compensation be paid if the genetic farmers healthy high value crop is contaminated by one of a lower value in each regard, NGO approved canola variety

I have not attached the reported article due to computer transmission difficulties but if it is essential that I send it please advise and I will send a copy by post

Thank you Hon. Wilson Tuckey