

**Subject:** Comments for GMO Moratorium Review  
**Date:** Thursday, 25 April 2019 7:06:28 PM

---

Old and initial promises of GM foods fixing the world's hunger needs have been belied by geopolitical and other distribution realities through time.

It is noticed that generally and consistently GM-free food produce commands higher returns for its producers comparatively.

Because of the resulting 'branding' of Tasmania as GM-free through time (since 2001), each further year of this status cumulatively compounds and confirms this niche marketing advantage. As this 'perceptual' advantage becomes more embedded as a produce image, the State becomes synonymous with feelings of desirability due to produce safety etc. The State's GM-free status implicitly interplays with its promoted tourism 'clean and green/wild natural environment' image. In latter years with a high-innovation/high-quality foods' and wines' reputation, publicity of the loss of Tasmania's GM-free status may majorly harm this market reputation. Thus food/drink producers **and** the tourism industry would suffer.

Aswell, since the phenomenon of Mona, Tasmania's quality/sophistication image has grown tremendously with the art/culture/food-drink/tourism sectors all interplaying and complementing each other, these all inter-supporting activities being the more achievable in a physically small land mass.

With more objective science emerging of the carcinogenicity of the chemical glyphosate, and because much of GM food production is known to tolerate and depend upon even greater amounts of this herbicide in world-wide food production, the food producers of any State or Country that is known to have GM-free status will increasingly enjoy higher advantage in export markets. [World-wide dissemination of the results of two separate, recent US Court challenges against Monsanto/Bayer (for glyphosate causing cancer) being found in favour of the respective cancer victims, will most likely continue to affirm glyphosate's toxic image for consumers, and thereby continue GM foods' undesirability. These two recent court cases are the first of an awaiting 11,000 others in the US alone.] With increasing awareness and education of many countries' food consumers, the demand for cleaner food will only increase.

With bee populations in dire trouble, and with numerous scientific studies showing glyphosate's deleterious effect upon the insect's cognitive and digestive systems, I personally as a consumer always check product labeling for 'Non-GM content', so 'doing my bit' for bees' (and my own) health. I believe three quarters of our food producing depends on bee pollination.

GM-free status for Tasmania, having a comparatively unique position of being an island, as a world-wide exporter, is arguably its most contributing factor of advantage. In the 'perceptual' and actual market for food-growing and export, and with its interconnectedness with tourism, future investment in the State for primary, secondary and tertiary growth in both industries would keep growing.

An acceptance of just one crop, for example GM canola, for such a small State upon which so much depends to be perceived as genuinely GM-free, clean and green, etc. would I

suggest be disproportionately disastrous, both for our present and our possible future economies.

With time, without governments protecting any major advantage peculiar to their particular State or Country, such places must thereafter compete on a considerably more vast spectrum of marketing factors, resulting in a guaranteed loss of market share with its own sacrifice to homogenization.

Thank you.  
Mrs Robin Thomas.