

**Email Submission: Erl Winter**

Dear Sirs/Madams, I am writing to urge that a highly cautious approach be taken on the matters being reviewed.

Drawing a comparison with the nuclear power industry:

We can see from the recent Fukushima 2011 disaster that major ways for nuclear power plants to go wrong were still being discovered by accident some 57 years after the first nuclear power plant became operational.

There are no grounds for believing that genetic modifications are incapable of producing disasters that dwarf Fukushima.

The threat posed by the inadvertent creation and escape into the environment of a highly fecund, genetically engineered organism that is deleterious or lethal, is so serious that it demands government regulation.

Beside the potential for human illnesses and deaths, and damage to the ecology and economy, there is also the risk of the public's attitude towards both science, and those charged with overseeing public health and safety, taking a very negative turn if significant, or even only fear-inducing, deaths or damage should result from a lack of regulation.

Additionally national bio-security will be enhanced by, or even depend on, regulation of methods of genetic manipulation. It is not inevitable that all who could chose to manipulate genes would be doing so for benevolent purposes.

If, after 60 years of the industry being conducted under government oversight, it is found to have been benign in its output then we would have sufficient experience and information to consider loosening restrictions.

To loosen, or neglect to create, restrictions now while we lack extensive, long-term experience or information however is dangerous folly.

Yours faithfully  
Erl Winter BSc.