

Please ask the question... Who is funding the science behind the so-called-facts supporting the case for GM foods and 'non-disclosed' labelling? I think we know. As Australia & NZ's regulatory body for food safety, I believe FSANZ must - indeed you have a mandate to insist upon - independent testing.

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.

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.

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.

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