

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

[REDACTED]
Thursday, 24 December 2020 4:57 PM

To:

submissions

Cc:

[REDACTED]

Subject:

Submission RE: A1193: Irradiation as a phytosanitary measure for all fresh fruit and vegetables

Categories:

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to this measure, which would effectively permit the irradiation of all fruits and vegetables in Australia.

I do not believe that food irradiation is necessary, given that safe non-chemical techniques are available.

Additionally, I do not consider food irradiation to be safe, given that it diminishes the nutritional content of food, and produces the chemicals benzene, formaldehyde and cyclobutanones. The presence of these chemicals has been verified by scientific testing.

This approval would multiply the quantity of irradiated food in the average Australian diet, resulting in unknown risks. Part of this increase would be caused by trade rules where each domestic approval requires irradiated imports of the same fruit or vegetable to be accepted.

Irradiated cat food was banned in the late 2000s, following cases where up to 100 cats died or were injured, in a characteristic manner involving neurological disorders and paralysis, after consuming it. The fact that this cat food irradiation ban has not been rescinded highlights Australia's lack of confidence in the across-the-board safety of irradiated food. If irradiated food is not safe for cats, then I am not willing to eat it myself.

In order to provide a meaningful choice, Australia needs to tighten up its labelling system, by requiring the use of the word 'irradiation' or 'irradiated', and mandating the use of 'irradiated' stickers on the produce itself rather than in a nearby location.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Oliver

[REDACTED]