



---

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,

Polling shows most Australians, and global citizens don't want to eat genetically modified (GM) foods. All GM foods should be independently assessed for their health and environmental hazards and risks, be labelled as GM, and be traceable. This will allow farmers, food producers, retailers, and shoppers to avoid them, for many important reasons.

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.

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 scientists with serious conflicts of interest, to conclude these new GM foods pose no greater risks than existing foods. Those seeking to commercialise 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 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 well known that GMO crops are unable to complete complex metabolic processes that we rely on for our health. GMO crops affect the shikimate pathways within the plant, thereby affecting the complex balance of micro and macronutrients within the plant. These nutrients are what humans have relied upon since the dawn of time to gain adequate health.

During this current pandemic we are faced with, it is well published that dietary and lifestyle choices affect outcomes of disease. It should therefore be the government's responsibility to ensure our food chains are safe guarded and protected to exist as naturally as possible, ensuring best possible outcomes in maintaining good health and reducing chronic disease, which is the real burden on today's health system.

In a true democratic society, polling and voices of your electorate, not to mention unbiased scientific evaluation and data should be used as the benchmark in making these decisions. Instead we see continued and growing policy approval based upon internal lobbying and not the true democratic process the sitting government was elected to uphold.

Claiming GMO foods is to combat climate change is categorically false. The impact GMO crops have on pollinators, which are vital to the delicate balance of all ecosystems, has been strongly and repeatedly shown to be detrimental. Combating climate change, needs to see the introduction of policies that protect, not threaten

this delicate balance.

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

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]