

submissions

From: submissions
To: kirsten blood
Subject: RE: Submission

From: kirsten blood [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 9 October 2014 9:02 AM
To: submissions
Subject: Submission

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing because I am deeply concerned with the latest request for FSANZ to lift the ban on food Irradiation on the following fruits and fruiting vegetables:

- Apple (*Malus domestica*),
- Apricot (*Prunus armeniaca*),
- Cherry (*Prunus avium*),
- Honey Dew (*Cucumis melo*),
- Nectarine (*Prunus persica* var. *nectarina*)
- Peach (*Prunus persica*)
- Plum (*Prunus domestica*),
- Rockmelon (*Cucumis melo*)
- Strawberry (*Fragaria x ananassa*)
- Table grape (*Vitis vinifera*)
- Zucchini (courgette) & scallopini / summer squash (*Cucurbita pepo*)

I have read the reports on your website that promote the lift on this ban and I have not changed my opinion. Currently Australia is providing good quality fruits and vegetables listed above at a good price and I do not believe this needs to change.

The following document:

"Supporting Document 2 Risk and technical assessment report – Application A109. Irradiation of Specific Fruits & Vegetable" page 1 states that:

"The weight of scientific opinion is that irradiated food is safe for consumption when irradiated at doses necessary to achieve the intended technological function and in accordance with good irradiation practice"

As a scientist myself, I understand that there are a great amount of scientists out there that do contest this statement. I have read a great deal of scientific articles that dispute the safety of food irradiation.

Also using the word 'negligible' in the following statement from the same document [page9]:

"Since no hazard has been identified following irradiation of food at 1 kGy, the risk posed by consuming irradiated fruits is considered to be negligible".

This means that there is still a risk, no matter how it is worded.

In addition, the word 'unlikely' is used on page 2 in the following quote:

"Adverse effects reported in cats and dogs following exclusive consumption of specific brands of pet foods irradiated at 50kGv are unlikely to be relevant to humans."

To me, this is not acceptable. There should be zero risk if these foods were to be irradiated and supplied here in Australia when alternatives are available.

Furthermore, the the very fact that radioactive cobalt-60, is being transported through our streets and used to irradiate foods is of grave concern. All Steritech plants here in Australia are in industrial zones extremely close to houses and most people who live nearby are unaware that a nuclear facility is located close by.

I do not believe that current labelling of Irradiated food is adequate, in which, it largely relies on the unsuspecting public. Sure one could research enough about irradiated food to avoid it somewhat, but there is no chance of avoiding it in hospitals, cafe's or even friends houses etc. I believe that it is being considered that these labelling laws may become even more relaxed and I find that incredibly frightening.

I am asking the FSANZ not proceed with the Application (A1092) as there is no absolute guarantee that our food will be safe for consumption, nor is there any guarantee that an accident will not occur during the transport of Cobalt-60 or within any of the irradiation facility here in Australia. Infact by increasing the number of fruits and fruiting vegetables that can be irradiated, it is highly likely that even more of these nuclear facilities will be required.

Yours Faithfully,
Kirsten Blood
BaAppSc.