

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it concerns,

Just because some people in this world don't know any better, doesn't mean that those of us who wish to maintain an organic, non-GMO diet should have to suffer. Those of us who maintain a proper healthy diet become more and more sensitive to the negative effects of chemicals and GMO foodstuffs the older we get. The inability to know whether or not we are buying organic and/or non-GMO food would be a direct assault on our health and livelihoods.

I therefore strongly oppose changes to the Food Code that would allow a wide range of GMO foods, made using novel methods that have scant history of safe use, to be sold without labelling. These would include meat and milk from some genetically modified animals and substances like vanilla and stevia produced by genetically modified microbes in factory vats. These changes would undermine FSANZ's key responsibilities to ensure food safety and our right to know what is in our food.

Agrochemical companies cannot be trusted to self-assess the safety of GM foods as they have an appalling record of manipulating data to promote dangerous products.

Gene editing techniques have been found to make genetic changes that could never occur in nature and to result in widespread genetic damage that often goes undetected by GM developers.

I am deeply concerned that FSANZ has relied on advice from pseudo-scientists with serious conflicts of interest, to conclude these new GM foods pose no greater risks than existing foods. Those seeking to commercialize GM plants, animals and microbes should play no role in deciding how - or even whether - foods derived from them should be regulated.

The proposed changes would make Australia one of very few countries in the world to allow genetically modified animal products into our food chain with no regulation or labelling. This would put them at odds with their international trading partners, which FSANZ admits "may have a significant impact on trade". The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, an international agreement signed by 166 governments worldwide, and the UN's food standards body Codex Alimentarius agree that all GM techniques differ from conventional breeding and that pre-market safety assessments are essential before GM organisms are used in food.

I support expanding the definition for 'gene technology' so FSANZ continues to assess and regulate all techniques and methods of genetic modification, other than conventional breeding. The proposal to deregulate new and emerging GM techniques and their food products, which pose new and unassessed risks, is completely unacceptable.

We cannot make "informed decisions" in "free will" if we are not properly informed. Just because you can make legislations to make something "legal" doesn't mean you are not breaking Natural Law, which is the foundation of all Law. The violation of Free Will is the only act which incurs a negative consequence under

Natural Law that many would call a Karmic Debt. If you won't keep us properly informed of our food for our sake, then at least do it for your sake.

Thank you for taking my well-founded and informed concerns into consideration.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]