

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

**GENE TECHNOLOGY BILL 2001
GENE TECHNOLOGY AMENDMENT BILL 2001**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
ON MONDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2003**

SESSION 2

Members

**Hon Christine Sharp (Chairman)
Hon Kate Doust (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Jim Scott
Hon Louise Pratt
Hon Frank Hough
Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Bruce Donaldson**

[11.15 am]

ROCHE, MR CHARLES
Rural Liaison Officer,
Conservation Council of Western Australia,
examined:

SIEWERT, MS RACHEL
Coordinator,
Conservation Council of Western Australia,
examined:

NEWMAN, MRS JULIE
National Spokesperson,
Network of Concerned Farmers,
examined:

The CHAIRMAN: You will each have signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood that document?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: If you are quoting any documents, would you please give the full title of the document, so that we have the reference. Also, because a transcript is being recorded, please use the microphones, particularly when you are sharing them, so that we have a good recording. You will be provided with a copy of your transcript, and then it will become a matter for the public record. You have the right, if you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, to request that the evidence be taken in closed session. The committee will consider your request, and if it is granted, any public or media will then be excluded from the hearing. Please note that, until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. The premature publication or disclosure may constitute a contempt of Parliament, and may mean that the material disclosed is not protected by parliamentary privilege. One or all of you might like to make a short statement to the committee on behalf of your organisations.

Ms Siewert: We would like to kick off the proceedings today with a short video that the Conservation Council and the Network of Concerned Farmers have produced. We think it makes a fairly eloquent statement about where we are coming from. We did not intend to go back over our submission; you have obviously all had that. Following the video, Charles would like to make a few short statements, as would Julie.

The CHAIRMAN: How long is the video?

Mr Roche: The video is eight minutes long. As a little bit of background, it was made in Williams in November 2002, and put together by a volunteer crew. All the people appearing in the film agreed to do so. They were approached at the Williams Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd receival point. That is where we came across them.

Mrs Newman: I would like to add that we just stayed at the CBH receival point. We did not select - everybody had an equal hearing, so we did not deliberately select. This is just one farmer after another.

The CHAIRMAN: I apologise for the limitations in the technology. There is only one screen, and it is facing this way. I hope you all have copies of the newspaper to read, or something.

Mr Roche: Please accept my apologies, as the film was made very cheaply, and it is starting to distort. If you bear with it, the message will remain the same.

[The eight-minute video film was shown to the committee.]

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Do you intend to make a statement, Mr Roche?

Mr Roche: Yes, I would like to make a statement. Firstly, the eight-minute video you have just seen is just one example of one part of a whole complex issue relating to genetically modified organisms. Different sections of the community could have made other films on the many different impacts. For example, conservation issues have not been a major focus of that video. The video is meant to show that the issue of GMOs has not been explored. I helped to make that video by driving to Williams one day, and driving back the next. It was a 24-hour operation, throwing in a bit of free editing time. My statement is that we need to make sure that we have the legislation and the policies to ensure that, in every single proposal relating to GMOs, the mechanisms are in place to protect Western Australian industries, the environment and consumers.

[11.30 am]

It is very easy to quote statistics and reports, which most of the community do not get time to understand or fully comprehend, or even to know who funded them. It is a great disappointment to me that most of the reports I read seem to be funded by the biotechnology industry or government agencies that are supporting GM.

Instead of looking at reports or incidents that may have happened in 1995, 1998 or even 2002, we need to look forward to ensure that the legislation that Western Australia puts in place has all the necessary safeguards to protect the industry, the consumers and the environment. As I have said, canola segregation is just one issue. Other issues of how GMOs might affect people's ethical stance and what they choose or choose not to eat could affect markets. There are consumer rights issues, questions of compensation and legal liability and conservation issues, such as those with salt-resistant crops. All these issues are part of a complex problem. It is inappropriate to focus too much on any one particular issue. I will push to make sure that legislation, policies and mechanisms are in place to protect all aspects of the Western Australian community.

Mrs Newman: I would like to draw the committee's attention to a rather serious, urgent issue for which I would like state intervention. As the committee will know, the Government is looking at the question of health in the environment. It is up to industry to decide when and how to introduce it. The problem is that the decision is being made by the Gene Technology Grains Committee, which is considered to be extremely biased towards GM. I believe that there has not been sufficient industry representation. There are a number of problems. We need non-biased information to be distributed in order that farmers may make a decision. The most common problem with the information out now is the difference between non-GM and GM products. I have spent some time in discussions with the West Australian manager of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, and I attended a Grains Research and Development Corporation conference in Sydney for three days. We discussed in depth the difference between GM and non-GM products. Farmers would be very surprised with the biotechnology in which they are investing because it is non-GM. When people are identifying frost tolerance and disease tolerance, they can pick them up in the genes and that can speed up the breeding process by up to 10 years through non-gene genomics. The improvements in the area of technology are going ahead in leaps and bounds. Farmers have been misled into believing that the biotechnology that is promised is GM. It is not; and advances in non-GM biotechnology must be considered.

The next point is the question of cost. I would like to table a number of documents, one of which is my submission to the Gene Technology Grains Committee. It contains a number of references to cost. This is not a made-up story; the subject has been studied intensely by a number of people. The cost is estimated to be 10 per cent of product value. Unfortunately, the Gene Technology Grains Committee protocol allocation of cost and liability makes it very clear that cost and liability

is on the non-GM grower. The protocol is supposed to be ratified on 10 March. We are meant to agree to plans of which the industry is not aware and into which industry has had very little input. This is extremely wrong. As members of the committee will know, the WA Farmers Federation has its policy meeting in April. All year we have put forward motions through the Grains Council. The unanimous motion six months ago not to accept Round-up ready canola trials or commercial release in Western Australia has been shelved until April, which is after the proposed commercial release. We must not allow the Gene Technology Grains Committee to ratify a protocol without representing industry, because representing industry is meant to mean representing industry. We are not ready and we are definitely not accepting those protocols. We do therefore need some help.

Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd conducted canola Eyre trials. I suggest that the committee contact CBH in order to find out how the trials went. That would be a good indication of whether CBH is ready to handle segregation. Although there has been no public statement from AWB, I had a telephone call from somebody from the South Australian Farmers Federation last week who stated that Andrew Lindberg said at a meeting that the AWB is 100 per cent against GMOs, because there is a zero tolerance of any GM contamination in wheat and barley. Andrew Lindberg is the chief executive officer of AWB.

We need statements from each sector of industry declaring if it is ready. The Network of Concerned Farmers WA has put out some proposals. We need to put a hold on any decisions until we have a full assessment of economic impacts. During the last submissions we heard that there were no market problems. China is our biggest customer. The Chinese have just tightened their policy. In order to sell to China, people need a safety interim certificate. The person marketing the product must guarantee its health and safety. The US Food and Drug Administration will not guarantee the health and safety of product. I have not heard it confirmed, but apparently Canada has not renewed its safety interim certificate since it ran out to incorporate those new proposals. As far as I am aware, Canada has not sent anything into China since November, which is our biggest market.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the biggest market for canola or grains?

Mrs Newman: Canola. However, other grains need to be looked at very seriously too. As the committee heard from the video, somebody had his barley contaminated with GM canola. The Australian Barley Board made the statement that Saudi Arabia will refuse to buy barley if Australia brings in GM canola. That will upset our entire industry. I am proposing that we have a full assessment of the economic impact. I really believe that it will be negligent not to. We cannot ratify a protocol saying that we agree to accept the cost and liability and we agree that we are ready when we are definitely not ready. I have contacted the GRDC, which has some extremely good models that would be able to cover that. The summary of the productivity commission report does not reflect the report, so we need to have the summary scrutinised by independent bodies and a decision reached on that basis.

The protection of existing systems is essential. The Gene Technology Grains Committee must take a serious approach or be disbanded and a committee formed that does represent a wider section of industry. We need to protect our existing systems by ensuring that the biotech companies are legally responsible for their product. It should not be those of us who do not want to adopt the GM crops.

As for industry preparedness, I have with me an example of a checklist that I have compiled. I gave it to the National Bulk Handling Companies Association meeting, and it agreed that the problems I have addressed are similar to those it needs to look at. The same applies to the Australian Wheat Board. Each industry representative I have approached can see nothing wrong with having a checklist to identify problems. We can only represent industry as being prepared when it has addressed its problems. A number of people are not involved in the Gene Technology Grains Committee, such as sheep farmers. If sheep are grazing canola, what can those farmers do with

their sheep. The seed will be in the wool and will be moved from paddock to paddock. There is no stock carryover at all. What do our seed works do with its seconds when we have pulled everything together with quality assurance? For every half-tonne load in our 300 tonne silo we are supposed to sign a document saying that it has no GM product. We do not know because we do not have a test available. Some serious issues need to be addressed. Each industry must identify its issues. It would be very negligent to introduce GM crops without some form of checklist to confirm that we really are ready or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to table that checklist?

Mrs Newman: Yes. I would like to table the Gene Technology Grains Committee submission, which contains a number of quotes to verify what I am saying about cost and liability. I also table a flyer that I will be putting out next week when I head off to the eastern States for a round of intensive meetings for 10 days with politicians, farmers bodies and the media. There seems to be no-one representing us non-GM farmers and how this will impact on us. It is very unfortunate that it is left to a few of us to try to get the message across. The flyer will be issued Australia-wide, as well as the document on industry preparedness for GM canola release, which contains a proposal plus a checklist.

I am not saying that I have all the answers. I have questions that I would like to be addressed. Those are the very basics that we ask for. If the Government allows this protocol to be endorsed when there has been insufficient industry representation, there must be some form of compensation for those of us who have been faced with the cost and liability without any say in it.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: Must you supply a certificate indicating that the grain is GM free?
newm: We do on the CBH form, but because we are not exporting canola oil but canola seed, which can be tested, it is scrutinised. The market demand is not for one per cent but for zero ideally, because the labelling legislation is for one per cent. At the moment we are selling on the basis of guaranteed no GM contamination in our non-GM product. The Office of the Gene Technology Regulator issues the certificate to the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service for quarantine if it needs it. Only certain markets request it.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: Are you doing it anyway now?

Mrs Newman: Yes, if there is a demand. Only the OGTR does it, and we as non-GM farmers do not have to do it. The day it is commercially released there is a change. The liability from trials, where the onus is on keeping GM in, to a commercial release, where the onus is on that the non-GM grower to keep it out, changes upon commercial release. Therefore, the OGTR cannot give that certificate for quarantine. We must prove that.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: Would it not be the other way round? As the GM crop would be the introduced crop, should OGRT not supply a certificate that says that it is GM food?

Mrs Newman: They could supply it for GM food, but we are selling to a non-GM market.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: It is non-GM now.

Mrs Newman: Under the existing plans there is a five-metre buffer zone, which is the Gene Technology Grains Committee recommendation, although the recommendation in the literature that was supplied to the Western Australian division recommends a three to five- kilometre zone for GM-free or organic product with a zero detectable tolerance. That is why I am asking that this protocol not be ratified.

[11.45 am]

Hon FRANK HOUGH: The video showed people expressing concerns about contamination. From the many aerial trips I have made over the past couple of years in particular, I have noticed that the canola crops stand out clearly. Forgetting the GM business, has barley or wheat been contaminated to any great degree?

Mrs Newman: Yes; we grade quite a lot out. They come into the seed where it is graded out. That is tested. It does not have to be labelled; it can be graded out. However, labelling canola is different. As Andrew Linberg explained, the DNA of wheat is eaten; it is not crushed. Wheat customers do not want any genetically modified wheat. That is why in North America - and I understand the committee has travelled there -

The CHAIRMAN: No; we will go at the end of April.

Mrs Newman: In North America more than 210 groups oppose the commercial release of GM wheat. That includes all the marketers and farming bodies because they cannot market it. Eighty-two per cent of Canadian Wheat Board customers refuse to touch GM wheat if it is brought in. It does not mean that non-GM wheat will be sold; it is too expensive and too difficult to segregate. More than eighty-two per cent of customers say that they do not want to deal with GM-wheat. That has extremely serious repercussions. That is an example of consumer rejection of GM products. That is why we cannot allow legislation to be introduced without an assessment of the economics. North America is having a battle fighting this because legislation has been implemented without economics being assessed.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Does that apply also to the wheat that is contaminated with GM canola?

Mrs Newman: No. It is just GM wheat. I am explaining the rejection of GM wheat. The Australian Barley Board customer of Saudi Arabia was one. We need to examine each market and find out the exact situation. I am working on the information I have been trying to extract. Saudi will stop buying barley from us if we bring in GM canola because we cannot guarantee that barley will not have GM canola in it.

Mr Roche: I am not sure whether anyone has tabled a copy of the Cooperative Bulk Handling Ltd delivery form.

Mrs Newman: I did so in the last submission.

Mr Roche: With regard to segregation, drivers must declare that they have no GM grain in their truck. I have carted eight to 10 truckloads per day to the bin and mixed grain in between paddocks. If a document must be signed stating that no GM grain is in the load, not only each load would need to be tested but also the paddocks from which the grain came. Farmers often mix grain, especially wheat, which is my main farming experience, to bring it under the right category to maximise the financial return. A lot of mixing occurs. It is another complication and expense for farmers to prove segregation. We must remember that although GM canola is the proposal at the moment, this legislation will guide all grains in Western Australia. Canola might be only a small part of Western Australia's production, but wheat is a major part of our export grain business. This legislation will apply to not only canola. We must look further afield at other segregation issues.

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: If Round-up ready canola got into a wheat crop and the wheat was stripped and it was delivered to the bin - there is always some seed because it is very hard to segregate, as you know - what problems could arise from that?

Mrs Newman: It would be a problem when it reached its destination. The country of destination could reject it. With regard to countries that are GM free that want to import wheat, we saw what happened with corn. We had to go through a great deal of rigmarole with one load of corn. If we accept that with all our produce we will limit our markets. We will have to guarantee a non-GM country that there is no GM in the product, and we cannot do that.

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: How does Canada get on when 70 per cent of its canola is Round-up ready and it is exporting wheat?

Mrs Newman: That is a serious issue. Andrew Linberg from the Australian Wheat Board is the person to talk to. Industry must be involved in this decision to indicate how many of their customers will accept it. We need to know how many customers are at risk. We cannot just guess

and say that rough enough is good enough and realise afterwards that we have a serious problem. We need a full economic assessment. We need our markets to be investigated thoroughly.

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: We will take that up with the Canadian people when we get there. It is interesting because some of the fear surrounding GM crops is that the potential for contamination to occur could affect GM-free products receiving accreditation. I will be interested to learn what effect it is having on Canadian wheat exports.

Mrs Newman: Canada has sourced the markets that will accept GM for its canola. An assessment needs to be made of whether that market is full. It is a matter of assessing the Australian markets and their demands.

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: A regulatory regime, with which I agree, has been established to provide consistency across Australia. There are obviously some shortfalls in that regime. Are you saying that the legislation should be amended because not enough information has been provided and research done into our markets? I read the submission from the Conservation Council of Western Australia. Which aspects of that uniform legislation should the State recommend be amended?

Mrs Newman: Firstly, I would like some accountability from the Western Australian Gene Technology Grains Committee to State Government. There must be some accountability. It cannot make decisions on behalf of industry without involving industry sufficiently. If the committee is to ratify a protocol on 10 March, that is urgent. Secondly, the State should recommend to the federal Government that commercial release should not occur until an economic assessment is made on the basis that our existing systems are protected. Thirdly, sufficient protocol should be ensured to allow a checklist of industry preparedness. Those are the three issues that I have referred to in the tabled documents.

The Gene Technology Grains Committee ignored the majority of submissions regarding cost and liability. The majority asked that cost and liability not be imposed on the non-GM grower; yet they are. The recommendation for a five-metre buffer zone is ridiculous. Why is industry not being given the chance to indicate its preparedness? There is a serious misunderstanding here.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that why you said at the beginning that you were concerned about bias in the Gene Technology Grains Committee?

Mrs Newman: Yes. The people on that committee to whom I have spoken are very determined to allow it in and are determined not to listen to my proof about the costings, for example. It is documented by a number of studies, reference to which is in a couple of pages I have here. There are costs. When the chairman of both committees can declare on Radio National that there is no cost to the non-GM grower, there is a serious misunderstanding within that committee of its own protocol. It is very obvious that costs will be incurred by the non-GM grower.

The CHAIRMAN: You also referred to the Grains Council making a unanimous decision. I take it that is the Grains Council of the Western Australian Farmers Federation.

Mrs Newman: I represent the Corrigin Lake Grace zone of the Grains Council of WAF. All the GM motions moved during the year have been tabled for review in April. If we are to ratify that protocol in March, a review in April will be too late.

The CHAIRMAN: Who will ratify the protocol in March?

Mrs Newman: The Gene Technology Grains Committee, on which WAFF farmers has two representatives, both of whom are in this room. The committee's aim is to ratify the protocol in March. I tried to table it at the last Grains Council meeting, but it was distributed only to the zones. No request has been made for feedback from the zones in time for the 10 March meeting. That concerns me; albeit, it is an internal issue that I am trying to address. My concerns may be

unfounded; the committee might not intend to ratify the protocol on 10 March. Nonetheless, we cannot allow it to ratify it and then say it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN: You mentioned in your opening statement advances in breeding technology using non-GM manipulation. Can you expand on where you suggest those interested should look for that kind of information?

Mrs Newman: The head of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation said that a wheat legume would not be developed in my lifetime. That is the sort of thing we are being promised. It is not possible because work is being done on moving only one gene over. That promise is encouraging people to think that it must be a good thing because we will get a legume in a cereal.

The CHAIRMAN: What about the alternative in improved breeding techniques using non-GM technology?

Mrs Newman: Some fantastic breakthroughs have been made in identifying genes such as the frost gene. When the crosses are being done, rather than breed out to see whether those crops have that frost gene, it can be seen from the seed whether it is there and it can be identified. It is a very good way of identifying frost and drought tolerance very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you taking the good component out of gene technology without using the manipulation part of the technology?

Mrs Newman: That is right. Consumer rejection is only for the recombinant DNA. Ten other plant-breeding techniques exist, including genomics. This breakthrough in genomics is more recent than recombinant DNA. It has exceptional potential for our industry as non-GM. However, farmers are not being told that; they are being told that that potential is GM. That is wrong.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I have two films at home on fish. It is a matter of show me one that will and I will show you one that will not. They are about the same fish, but there are two different stories. I watched your film, and I ask you honestly: did you edit any farmers out of it? The reason I ask is that they were all going down the same line. Why did you pick Williams? I am not saying that anything dishonest is involved; it is just a question I ask.

[12 noon]

Mr Roche: We picked Williams because we were limited in how far we could drive. I had to use my own car for this. Williams farmers were still harvesting canola at that time. Naturally, there was an editing process. I was not involved in that. That was done by a university student. You would be right in assuming that he made the video that he thought we would want. That is precisely why I made the point at the conclusion of the video that this is one aspect of a very complicated issue. I did not bring it here to try to gloss over the issue and say, "This is it, now please support this cause". In a way, it is about the complexity of the issue and the fact that the farmers on the ground are not being asked. I would like to widen that and say that I acknowledge that farmers and the industry need to be asked, but we also need to remember the wider community, and it does not seem to have been asked about this issue at all. I understand your concerns about the video. That is precisely why I made the comment about slotting it into a wider reading and understanding of that issue.

Mrs Newman: I was there for the filming. We asked questions of the farmers as they came up the ramp. The committee could go to any bin and ask the same questions. That is why we left in the bit showing the most pro-GM guy we met saying that he did not really care, although he did not want to be affected himself. The main attitude is, "as long as it does not affect me, you can do what you like". They do not realise that it will affect them.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: It is the jack system.

Mrs Newman: That is right.

Hon JIM SCOTT: I have some environmental concerns. Great things have been made about both the GM and non-GM salt-resistant wheat varieties that have been developed. My concern with these sorts of technological fixes is that although it might be okay for an individual farmer continuing to get some gain from salt-affected land, the use of such wheat would surely militate against the use of deep-rooted plants in areas in which we should be trying to reduce the water table. The water table is clearly the problem.

My second concern is about the spread of resistant weeds into areas of natural vegetation and the difficulty of getting rid of them using traditional herbicides.

Ms Siewert: I agree with your concern about using this sort of technology to generate wheat to grow in saline areas. It will do nothing to reduce the water table because wheat is an annual crop. We all know that salinity is caused by the replacement of deep-rooted vegetation with annual crops. This technology will purely allow a farmer to make some money out of that area. I am not saying that that is a bad thing. Obviously, farmers with large amounts of salt-affected land want to make a buck out of it. They are doing a lot of work with saltbush and things like that. In answer to your question, it will not solve the salinity problem. To do that we will need to get more deep-rooted vegetation into the ground.

We are extremely concerned about environmental weeds. There are reports of cotton escapes from the trials in the Kimberley. There are reports of cotton bushes being found in native vegetation. That is a large concern for us. We are also doing a lot of work on the proposed biodiversity conservation Act, and the issue of environmental weeds has been raised in that context. We strongly hope that the Act will include a mechanism to allow Western Australia to deal with environmental weeds. At the moment, it cannot. The agricultural protection legislation deals with agricultural weeds. The interesting issue that arose during a recent discussion is how we will deal with GMOs that escape and become environmental weeds. We are starting to get our heads around that. That will need to be dealt with through legislation. When does a GMO become a weed?

Mr Roche: I expand on the point about the salt-tolerant species. Salt-tolerant species and insulin are frequently used to justify GM technology. So far, the GM technology that has been released has cost billions of dollars to produce, and it is all produced by multinational companies that also produce chemicals - herbicides - for broadacre agriculture. Although we are starting to work towards a salt-resistant crop produced using GM technology, we are an awfully long way from producing that as a solution to any of the land management issues in Western Australia. In some ways it is disingenuous to claim that GM technology will lead to that. It will require an awful lot of money - more than the Western Australian State has got to put into it.

Mrs Newman: The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation will release a non-GM salt-tolerant wheat variety in two to three years. That research is far more advanced than that into GM salt-tolerant wheat. Out of interest, the Gene Technology Grains Committee has determined that liability for environmental contamination on roadsides will be held by the truck driver.

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: Do you foresee a day when the world importers have to move to premium pricing for non-GMOs? GMO crops are being utilised around the world. There is a premium on organic produce. Customers at Sainsbury's in England pay extra for organically farmed produce. It was interesting to read in a United Kingdom medical journal that the use of organic produce does not exempt people from gastroenteritis; in fact, it gives them a greater chance of contracting it. I do not know whether that is correct; I am not a doctor or a scientist. The rest of the world will use GMOs. It is expected that 70 million hectares of genetically modified crops will be grown this year. That will increase. If there were a premium price level - one hopes that one day the importers might consider this - we could leave ourselves as an island nation free of GMOs. What is the answer? Farmers could miss out on a 15 per cent productivity gain. Why should they not get a premium?

Mrs Newman: Consumers are willing to pay a premium. That is certain. Japanese company Jusco is the third-largest canola crusher. Its product is GM free. It has no contamination. It sells its product at a 36 per cent premium. However, the cost of segregation throughout its supply chain eats up that premium, so it is not passed on to farmers. The majority of consumers worldwide are rejecting GMOs. The polls show that 80 per cent of Italian consumers will not accept GMOs even if they are cheaper and taste better. China would have the lowest figure, and even 40 per cent of Chinese customers would not accept GMOs if they were 10 per cent cheaper. You say that the yields benefit is 10 to 15 per cent better; however, according to the Productivity Commission report produced by Agrifood Awareness Australia, the use of Roundup-ready canola provides a two per cent increase in productivity. Even the graph in the Monsanto company's glossy brochure on Roundup-ready canola shows only a two per cent improvement in wheat control. That is not much of a productivity gain for what we have to lose. That is why we need an economic assessment.

The CHAIRMAN: We will finish there. Thank you very much for all your information.