

Environment and Public Affairs Committee

From: Peter Cocks
Sent: Wednesday, 29 August 2018 1:07 AM
To: Environment and Public Affairs Committee
Subject: BD AAA answers to questions at the hearing on 29th august 2018 (9.30 - 10.15am)

The Bio Dynamic Agricultural Association of Australia (BD AAA) is saying our Demeter BioDynamic method of Farming is best practice , pure , world class natural farming . We think it is the greatest development in Agriculture (soil culture , plants and animals , our food and fibre) on Earth , ever .

We include our basic training page for our members , which is the nuts and bolts of our method , for public information .

We receive premium prices for what we produce and our consumers have created a stronger demand every year for 30 years, in WA.

Consumers pay a premium price because our product is guaranteed to be free of artificial contaminants . in the case of GM zero tolerance , none , zip .

Together we expect this Parliament to protect our method of farming and the supply of our food to you and your voters.

The scope of the statewide exemption granted under the repealed Act for GM canola completely eliminated all positive effects of the Act for BioDynamic (BD) farmers.

This is because any contamination to any part of a BD farm with GM product results in the farmer loosing their certification and not remaining eligible to supply BD produce .

It's not to late to role back the Act without the statewide exemption bit that wrecked it.

1.1

- What is and always was essential for any farmer wishing to be GM- free is a proper planning regime under which GM is only permitted in specific geographic areas. With that type of planning regulation, BD farmers can choose not to farm on land in or adjoining an area declared a GM zone .

Not only would there be protection for BD farmers through having limited GM zones enabling their certification to the National Standard for Organic and Biodynamic Produce v3.7 to stay intact , but the same protection would be available for all GM - free farmers , if they wish , from GM infestations .

What is appropriate under State law is appropriate planning to ensure GM crops are grown only in limited declared zones . If that type of planning is appropriately implemented, produce grown outside the limited declared GM zones will not require expensive testing for export marketing to prove it is GM-free because it will be safe to assume GM infestation does not occur beyond declared GM zones.

The result would be that a planning system with declared limited GM geographic zones will provide significant marketing expense savings for all non- GM production, whether produced by Conventional , Certified Organic or Biodynamic Farmers

- The user pays should apply , and a top up mechanism maybe ,for taxpayers
- The losses we have identified in our submission is the primary loss .
- I cannot believe this is being done . They may successfully grow non GM and GM side by side . They must be passing off GM product as non GM. If they are growing both crops . Infact they are growing GM and purported non GM . Therefore cannot be validly described as non GM .

1.2

- The BD AAA operator who provided the quote was and is putting in place standard procedures outlined in the National Standard for Organic and BioDynamic Produce v3.7 .
- Since GM canola was granted a statewide exemption from the prescribed zones Act by a single minister .
- No I don't have any reports of GM material present or growing on our members farms .
- Our Organisation supported Steve along with big consumer groups , gm free farmers WA and the big Organic Certifiers .

None of this support compared to the bully Monsanto supported over the road and won

- I refer to our answer to 1.1 and add this makes for legitimate insurance and reduces the amount of legitimate claims for any compensation scheme that this Parliament chooses .The "right to farm" legally enforceable protection for non GM farmers with GM incursions goes hand in glove with an act that served us well for fifteen years until it was undone by GM canola infestation.

1.3

My position is that the developers of Biotechnology (such as Monsanto)will not be even slightly deterred by GM Compensation scheme . It will probably encourage them . Recognise the validity of their stuff . The recent USA court case in San Francisco against Monsanto demonstrates the steps they take to promote their technology .

1.4

- That is not correct . The compensation scheme should establish an administration body that does not need a court case to decide .

- Spurious , these goods may have been found to be safe but there is a vast community demand for products without GM

Given this demand for no gm in our food the question is whether a federal (early stage) regulator can get it right .

- One of the usual qualities of BD Growers is that they are ethical and honest . No incentive scheme will ever fully compensate a BD farm. It's the type of logic used by Monsanto.
- If the existing common law provides sufficient protection. Then according to the facts on that case in common law , it didn't.

1.5

- BD farmers see roundup as the poison cousin of GM . As such we would benefit from any enforced legislation to stop the overspray of roundup on our boundary fences
- BD farming methods result in little runoff . It is unlikely any weeds would leave a BD farm by choice .

1.6

We wrote the first National Standard for Export and consumers forced Australian Wholesalers to adopt our international Export Standard as a Domestic Standard .

The current National Standard for Organic and BioDynamic Produce v3.7 is audited by the IOAS and AuAg .
And because of consumers in this state we have a market to protect and cherish , unlike GM .

1.7 refer above

1.8 refer 1.3

1.9

This is baseless. Anyone who makes a legitimate claim needs protection from the likes of Monsanto.

1.10

- He could not be legitimately selling GM free produce . They are not disclosing it properly.

Lucky if they don't go to prison and or it's a joke .

- The National Standard for Organic and BioDynamic Produce v3.7 outlines the steps required to keep GM incursions to a minimum . It is hugely expensive, time consuming and corrosive .

1.11 refer to 1.6

We are not changing our Industry standard just because it suits the on going fraudulent activity that is Monsanto
Refer to the recent High Court case in Europe on the new GM just as bad as the old and the wrecking of
agriculture and clean food by the deregulation of GM .

BDAAA Training Points

Below are some basic considerations to get across when training others in the Australian Demeter BD method. Do it in your own style and order and be pragmatic.
It is all the small steps done with quality that can add up to the good result.

PLANT FEEDING

Humus vs water soluble

(a fundamental to grasp before moving forward)

SOIL STRUCTURE / CULTIVATION

Plant roots relationship to soil structure

Do you need to create the soil conditions for soil biology to flourish?

Does the soil need compaction relief?

Discuss soil cultivation.

BUILDING HUMUS

Green Manuring – Sheet Composting

Pasture management – Rotational Grazing

Appropriate use and timing of inputs

THE PREPARATIONS

Prepared 500

Correct timing for application of using the preps

500 and 501 Storage

Stirring and spraying

Air + roots + 500 = soil structure

Air + 500 + organic matter = humus

Suggested reading.

Biodynamics – Agriculture of the Future

Living Agriculture

Biodynamic Agriculture Introductory Lectures Vol 1

Environment and Public Affairs Committee

From: Peter Cocks
Sent: Wednesday, 29 August 2018 1:22 AM
To: Environment and Public Affairs Committee
Subject: Fwd: European Court of Justice ruling

Ref for 1.11

FYI

From: Louise Sales
Sent: Monday, 30 July 2018 5:17 PM
To: BDRI Demeter <info@demeter.org.au>
Subject: IMP: European Court of Justice ruling

Dear Lynton,

I hope you are well. I just wanted to make sure that you are aware that the European Union's top court ruled last week that new genetic modification (GM) techniques such as CRISPR pose similar risks to older GM techniques and need to be assessed for safety in the same way. The ruling directly contradicts the recommendations of the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) and Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) that a number of these techniques should be deregulated.

The trade implications if these techniques are deregulated here are significant. The Government's proposed changes could make Australia the first country in the world to deregulate genetically modified animals. And key export markets such as Europe and China have a zero tolerance for unapproved GMOs. I've attached a factsheet that describes the potential market impacts of these techniques for your information.

More and more evidence is also coming to light about the potential environmental and human health risks posed by these techniques, belying the biotechnology industry's claim that they are precise and predictable.

According to the European Court of Justice ruling, "excluding organisms obtained by new mutagenesis techniques from the scope of the GMO Directive would compromise the objective pursued by that directive, which is to avoid adverse effects on human health and the environment, and would fail to respect the precautionary principle which that directive seeks to implement."

The Australian Government is currently conducting reviews of the Gene Technology Scheme, its Gene Technology Regulations and how the Food Standards Code applies to these techniques. The Legislative and Governance Forum on Gene Technology is expected to make a decision in the coming weeks as to whether these techniques will be regulated in Australia.

I would strongly urge you and your members to contact the members of the Forum and point out the potential environmental, health and market impacts if Australia is to deregulate these techniques:

<http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/gene-gtmc.htm#composition>

I'd also urge you to contact the Federal Agriculture Minister to relay your concerns:

<http://minister.agriculture.gov.au/littleproud/Pages/Contact.aspx>

If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes,

Louise Sales

--

Louise Sales, MSc.
Emerging Tech Project Coordinator
Friends of the Earth
c/o 130 Davey Street
Hobart, TAS 7000
Australia

Environment and Public Affairs Committee

From: Peter Cocks
Sent: Wednesday, 29 August 2018 1:28 AM
To: Environment and Public Affairs Committee
Subject: Fwd: Error paragraph 3

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Liz Louw
Date: 6 August 2018 at 10:12:06 am AWST
To: Peter Cocks
Subject: Error paragraph 3

Morning Peter

As per conversation, there is only ONE Australian Standard.

I think that there may be confusion as NASAA and ACO have private standards to which they certify producers.

We are audited by the DOA and the IOAS to the National Standards for Organic and Bio – Dynamic Produce v 3.7 only. I hope this clears up the paragraph 3 error.

Thank – you and kind regards

Liz

Elizabeth Louw
Compliance Manager

*Bio-Dynamic Research Institute
P.O. Powelltown, Vic 3797
Ph (Office) : 03 5966 7333 Fax: 03 5966 7433*