

Dear Secretary,

I herein make a submission to the Senate Inquiry into the patenting of genes.
I strongly recommend *against* the granting of a patent for genes - that is, the *discovery* of something that *already exists*.

If something has not been invented, then under no circumstances should any person or organisation be granted an exclusive right to the use of that thing.

A gene is not something novel and created, or "invented", by anyone.

Someone may develop a process that is novel/new that may be patentable (in the ubiquitous understanding of the term), but a thing that is naturally occurring should never be patentable. I am prompted to make this submission as a result of hearing a view on ABC Radio National today suggesting that the patenting of genes can be justified on the basis that, if they were not patentable, then the outcome would be a reduction in important medical research. Such an argument (and it is an argument that would attract quite an alternative view I am sure) is largely irrelevant - it presents a classic case of the end justifying the means, and a disregard of principles.

I would be grateful if you can accept my submission.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Bourne