



**PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION  
OF AUSTRALIA**

## ***GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS***

***The Public Health Association of Australia notes that:***

1. There is considerable controversy over the production and use of genetically modified (GM) foods because of concerns over the health, environmental, social, economic, ethical and political effects of these foods<sup>1-3</sup>. There are still remarkably few independent assessments of the effects of GM foods on these matters<sup>4</sup>.
2. Most GM foods are made from GM crops. Most GM crops are made by inserting DNA from bacteria, viruses, plants or animals into a plant to get the plant to produce one or more proteins that it would not normally produce. The process is therefore very different from conventional plant breeding.
3. Proponents of GM food argue that gene technology has the potential to be useful in enhancing the quality, safety, nutritional value and variety of food available for human consumption and in increasing the efficiency of food production and processing<sup>2,5</sup>.
4. Critics of GM food warn that there is insufficient evidence that these foods are safe for humans and the environment. In particular, the methods used to insert genes into plants could disrupt the functioning of the plant, resulting in changed production of existing substances and the production of completely novel toxic or allergenic substances<sup>6</sup>. In addition, the global economic, social, ethical and political implications of these crops are largely unknown. Some of the information which does exist points to deleterious effects on health, the environment and on the social and economic milieu, particularly in developing countries<sup>6-9</sup>.
5. At present, almost all GM crops currently eaten are herbicide-tolerant, or produce their own pesticide(s), or both. Herbicide-tolerant crops are designed to be able to withstand herbicide sprays without dying, leading to possibly higher residues of herbicides in food. Insect-protected plants make their own insecticides. Unlike agricultural sprays, these proteins have no withholding period applied to them before consumption and residues cannot be washed off by consumers as they are produced throughout the plant tissue.
6. In Australia, regulation of GM crops and foods is undertaken by three regulatory bodies. The Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) approves the use of insecticidal genes present in GM crops, including those from Bt crops and registers them as an agricultural chemical product. The Office of Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) regulates the release of GM plants into the

environment and any associated human health and safety and environmental issues. It does not deal with issues such as food labelling, the use of insecticides and herbicides, segregation of crops, marketability or trade implications. Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) regulates foods derived from GM crops in Australia and New Zealand, including the regulation of imported foods and the labelling of GM foods.

7. Standard A18 of the Food Standards Code defines GM food, specifies the requirements for pre-market approval and labelling and prohibits the sale of GM food unless included in the standard.
8. GM versions of soya bean, canola, corn, potato, sugarbeet and cotton have been approved for sale in Australia by FSANZ. The foods are widely present in breads, pastries, snack foods, baked products, oils, fried foods, confectionary, soft drinks, and sausage skins. Labelling laws do not cover foods that are made from animals fed with GM feed (for example, meat, milk, eggs, honey), that are highly refined (for example, cooking oils, sugars, starches), or that are prepared at bakeries, restaurants and takeaways. These laws also exclude foods 'unintentionally' contaminated by up to one per cent per ingredient, that are made with processing aids or food additives using GM microbes, or that contain GM flavours present at less than one per cent<sup>6,10</sup>.
9. There is considerable consumer resistance to consuming GM foods and hence there is strong demand from consumers for more thorough labelling of GM food<sup>11-13</sup>.
10. There is currently no policing of GM food labelling laws. A DNA test to determine the GM content of various foods is expensive. None of the federal, State or local governments are currently doing these tests. Manufacturers are therefore unlikely to get caught if they do not appropriately label foods containing GM ingredients.
11. There are no surveillance systems set-up to determine the effects of GM foods on health, and no-one is paid to look in existing surveillance systems for problems.
12. A critique by a PHAA member of the safety assessments undertaken on GM crops<sup>6</sup> points out that some GM crops have had no animal safety studies done on them before being approved as safe to eat. If animal feeding studies are done, they usually involve feeding only a single dose of the new protein that the GM plant is designed to produce and essentially watching for 7-14 days to see if any animals die. If animals are fed the actual GM plant, they are generally only fed for four weeks and measurements relevant to animal production tend to be taken, such as death rates, weight gain, and meat and milk production. Measurements relevant to human health such as measures of organ health and *in vivo* allergy studies are rarely undertaken. Moreover, the studies are often done on farm animals such as chickens, quail, trout and cows, when the physiology of these animals is quite different to humans. If autopsies are done, they are generally only gross autopsies where organs are not inspected for damage under a microscope. Others have similarly raised concerns about the adequacy of the safety testing of GM crops in the food supply<sup>4,14</sup>.

13. One of the main concerns about GM crops is that they may produce new allergens. Yet if allergy testing is done, it rarely involves any *in vivo* testing. When an *in vivo* allergy test was recently done on a GM pea produced by the CSIRO, the pea was found to unexpectedly cause a strong allergic reaction in mice. Mice also spontaneously became allergic to other substances such as eggs<sup>15</sup>. Consequently, there is a need for *in vivo* allergy testing to be done on all GM crops.
14. GM crops are protected by patents on the genes inserted into them. Wherever these genes land, they belong to the patent owner or licence-holder. If the patented genes enter a farmer's crop via pollen, seeds spilled from passing trucks or contaminated seed stocks, the farmer must still pay royalties for possessing the genes. Farmers signing Technology User Agreements to officially use these crops sign away many rights and attain liabilities. Farmers are also prevented from saving seeds from their crop. A high proportion of GM crops are dependent on the application of expensive herbicides to work effectively. There are therefore significant concerns about the effect of these crops on farmers' livelihoods, particularly in developing countries<sup>16</sup>.
15. GM crops contain self-replicating genetically modified genes. Once they are released into the environment, particularly on a commercial scale, they cannot be recalled.

***The Public Health Association of Australia affirms the following principles:***

16. The primary objectives of food regulation are the protection of public health and safety and the provision of information to consumers to ensure informed decision making.
17. The precautionary principle should be applied in developing GM food as it is not certain whether there are serious risks to the environment or to human health involved in producing or consuming GM foods or their products.
18. Assessments of the effects of GM foods on matters such as health, agronomy and the environment should be based on thorough, independent experimental evidence rather than assumption. In particular, GM foods should not be assessed as safe to eat unless they have undergone long-term animal safety assessments utilizing endpoints relevant to human health and conducted by independent researchers.
19. The regulatory process should be independent and transparent to ensure public health and consumer interests are foremost.

***The Public Health Association of Australia believes that the following steps should be taken:***

20. Thorough independent research into the effects of GM foods on agronomy, health, society, the environment and the economy should be undertaken, and until this work is completed, all governments in Australia should impose an immediate and indefinite freeze on:
  - the growing of GM crops for commercial purposes

- the importation of GM foods and food components
  - the patenting of genetic resources for food
21. A comprehensive monitoring and surveillance system to track the effects of GM foods should be instigated.
  22. The labelling system should be improved to the standards desired by consumers, so that consumers can easily identify foods containing ingredients originating from GM animals and plants, and from animals fed GM feed.
  23. There should be thorough policing of the labelling laws by FSANZ and State health departments and an annual budget set-aside for this.
  24. There should be an assessment of the effects of intellectual property protection measures.

***The Public Health Association of Australia resolves to:***

25. Advocate for the continuation of state-based moratoria on the commercial planting of GM crops in Australia until thorough independent studies can be done into the agronomic, environmental and health impacts of GM crops in Australia, and the results are publicly disseminated and discussed.
26. Advocate for publicly funded and independent research into the health, agronomic, environmental, social, economic and political impacts of GM crops in Australia.
27. Advocate for the labelling of all foods (including fresh, processed, packaged, unpackaged, restaurant and fast food) derived from genetic engineering, foods containing ingredients which are the product of genetic engineering, and foods from animals fed GM feed, regardless of whether they contain new or altered genetic material and/or protein, and regardless of whether they contain this material below an arbitrary threshold level.
28. Advocate for the policing of labelling laws by FSANZ and State governments.
29. Communicate with other public health and consumer groups to enhance advocacy efforts.
30. Advocate for a strong public health presence in the staff, advisory committees and Boards of the APVMA, OGTR and FSANZ to improve safety assessment procedures.

***References:***

1. First Australian Consensus Conference on Gene Technology in the Food Chain 10-11 March 1999, website at: [<http://www.austmus.gov.au/consensus/02.htm>] (March 1999).
2. Jones L. Genetically modified foods. *BMJ* 1999; 318:581-584.
3. Dixon B. The Paradoxes of genetically modified foods. *BMJ* 1999; 318: 547-548.

4. Domingo JL. Toxicity studies of genetically modified plants: a review of the published literature. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. 2007; 47:721-733.
5. Position of the American Dietetic Association: Biotechnology and the future of food, c1994, website at: [<http://www.eatright.org>].
6. Carman C. Is GM food safe to eat? In: Hindmarsh R, Lawrence G editors. *Recoding Nature: Critical Perspectives on Genetic Engineering*. Sydney: UNSW Press; 2004. p. 82-93, references 228-229.
7. Risks of genetic engineering, Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, nd, website at: [[http://www.ucsusa.org/food\\_and\\_environment/genetic\\_engineering/risks-of-genetic-engineering.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/food_and_environment/genetic_engineering/risks-of-genetic-engineering.html)], Australian GeneEthics Network, website at: [<http://www.geneethics.org>], Australian Consumers Association, website at: [<http://www.choice.com.au>] and Consumers International, website at: [<http://www.consumersinternational.org>].
8. British Medical Association. *The Impact of Genetic Modification on Agriculture, Food and Health: An Interim Statement*. London: BMA Print and Design Unit, 1999.
9. Genetic roulette. The documented health risks of genetically engineered foods. Smith JM. Fairfield: Yes! Books; 2007.
10. Food Standards Australia New Zealand , website at: [<http://www.foodstandards.gov.au>].
11. Biotechnology Australia. Trends in Australian community attitudes regarding GM foods in 2006, Available from: <http://www.biotechnology.gov.au/index.cfm?event=object.showContent&objectID=E6F3DEA2-960B-38D5-E1BADCE724181C1B>
12. Swinburne University of Technology. Swinburne National Science and Technology Monitor 2007. Available from: <http://www.swinburne.edu.au/lss/acets/monitor/2007MonitorFull.pdf>
13. Mark Ragg, 'Modified food must be labelled, say 93%', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, Tuesday, 3 August, 1999.
14. Freese W, Schubert D. Safety testing and regulation of genetically engineered foods. *Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering Reviews*. 2004; 21. Available at: <http://www.intercept.co.uk/gb/not.asp?id=RS6HS3O6S6ROTD&rec=oui&pos=0&referer=%2Fgb%2Fdetail.asp%3Faction%3Dcurrent>
15. Prescott VE, Campbell PM, Moore A, Mattes J, Rothenberg ME, Foster PS, Higgins TJV, Hogan SP. Transgenic expression of bean  $\alpha$ -amylase inhibitor in peas results in altered structure and immunogenicity. *J Agric Food Chem*. 2005; 53:9023-9030
16. Network of Concerned Farmers. Website at: [<http://www.non-gm-farmers.com>]

***First adopted at the 1999 Annual General Meeting of the Public Health Association of Australia, amended at the 2002 Annual General Meeting, revised 2007 and adopted at the PHAA AGM 2007.***