

[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,

I am vehemently against the changes to the food code that would allow GM foods not to be labelled as such. If are going to be bombarded with GM products we have a right to know.

It has not been widely reported but the tests on GM products at the CSIRO (in particular peas) showed devastating results on the animals that the GM products were given to. We should not be the test subjects to these GM experimental foods.

I therefore strongly oppose changes to the Food Code that would allow a wide range of GM foods, made using novel methods that have scant history of safe use, to be sold without safety assessment or 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. The mere fact that Roundup is still available on our shelves shows how much pull companies such as Bayer/Monsanto has over our governing bodies and now seemingly the FSANZ.

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.

It is a concern that FSANZ has relied on advice from scientists with serious conflicts of interest, to conclude these new GM foods pose no greater risks than existing foods. There is a huge body of evidence to suggest otherwise.

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 us at odds with our 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.

It is ironic that Australia has such stringent restrictions on what natural substances and food that you can and cannot bring into the country for fear of spread of insects and disease, yet you are considering allowing GM food products in, without consideration of the impact that it is having on the population.

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.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]