1 individuals. I would like to think those of you within
2 the FDA, who have stood against the current policies of
3 this agency, who have shown by your actions and attitudes
4 that you value principles above propaganda, science above
5 ignorance, and the public good above corporate profits.
6 Please understand that my coming remarks to the
7 agency are not directed at you. And thank you for your
8 continued effort on our behalf.
9 Two recently published epidemiological studies
10 in Europe have found a statistically significant risk from
11 Round-Up exposure for hairy cell leukemia and non-Hodgkin
12 lymphoma. In a polled analysis that is about to be
13 published, this risk is large. Because of FDA's policies
14 of secrecy, the public has absolutely no way to protect
15 itself from surprises, such as this, should this finding
16 prove to pose a danger to the food supply. I propose that
17 we label these crops "Round up ready for cancer crops."
18 The FDA has gone out of its way to hide the
19 truth from us; and, then, to use our ignorance to gloat
20 that we do not care. Seattle has proved that attitude to
21 be a lie. We are willing to face beatings, gasings, false
22 arrests, and all manner of police brutality to let you
23 know that your policies will not stand. The chemical
24 industry and the shareholders of Monsanto can be damned.
25 I saw nothing in the Food Quality Production Act that

1 requires the FDA to protect the profits of Monsanto or Dow
2 or the rest.
3 This is not about democracy; it's not about
4 science. It's not about feeding the planet. This is
5 about the almighty dollar, and the raw power money has to
6 subvert even the highest levels of government to the will
7 of corporate boardrooms. Some things are in order,
8 however. Thank you for being so blatant in your groveling
9 subservience to the chemical industry —
10 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
11 MR. GUY: — that you've finally woken a vast
12 public outrage that will only continue to grow.
13 MR. LAKE: Thank you.
14 [Applause.]
15 STATEMENT OF
16 CAROL B. SLOAN
17 NUTRITION AND FOOD SERVICE CONSULTANT
18 MS. SLOAN: Good afternoon. I'm Carol Berg
19 Sloan. I'm a registered dietitian and a member of the
20 American and the California Dietetic Association. I have
21 a nutrition consulting service and work primarily in the
22 area of food safety. I consult with restaurants and
23 health care facilities and conduct over 300 food service
24 safety inspections every year.
25 My experience consulting in food service

1 departments indicates that food service employees are
2 mainly concerned with the model food code, and that food
3 products meet the general sanitation requirements of the
4 California Retail Food Facilities Law. Not whether or not
5 a food is genetically engineered.
6 What issues are of greatest concern in food
7 service? Prevention of cross-contamination, prevention of
8 food-borne illness, and also more education is needed in
9 the food handling techniques. More time and effort should
10 be spent in this area instead of whether or not we should
11 use foods that are bioengineered.
12 Consumers also want nutritious food that is
13 tasty, convenient and affordable. If a technology is
14 available which will help reduce the use of pesticides,
15 offer plant disease protection, reduce the use of
16 fungicides, is environmentally friendly and will improve
17 the quality, nutrient content and productivity of the food
18 supply, why not embrace and support it, for what is more
19 precious than a nation's food supply?
20 The FDA continues to regulate the safety of our
21 food supply and top priority has always been that new
22 genetically engineered products are safe to the
23 environment and to animal and human health.
24 Allergenic proteins should not be a concern, for
25 they're rigorously tested by the EPA and the FDA. The

1 process of determining allergenicity and other safety
2 issues of a new food are similar to those that
3 pharmaceutical companies must undergo for approval of a
4 new drug. Concerned consumers should seek balance
5 coverage based on sound science because of the emotion and
6 skewed logic that often accompanies new technology.
7 As a registered dietitian and a parent, I am
8 very excited about the future of biotechnology for my
9 profession and for the future of all consumers.
10 Thank you very much.
11 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
12 [Applause.]
13 STATEMENT OF
14 KATHY MANNION
15 DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
16 WESTERN GROWERS ASSOCIATION
17 MS. MANNION: Good afternoon. I'm Kathy
18 Mannion. I'm the director of Government Affairs for the
19 Western Growers Association. WGA members grow, pack and
20 ship fresh produce in California, in Arizona. I've
21 submitted more extensive comments. I'll just make a few
22 points at this time.
23 WGA supports the current FDA science-based
24 labeling policy with respect to food, or food ingredients,
25 derived through biotechnology. This policy provides that

1 products of food biotechnology are subject to the same FDA
2 labeling and safety policies applied to all foods in the
3 U.S. marketplace.
4 WGA supports the FDA labeling policy which
5 allows for voluntary labeling statements that are truthful
6 and not misleading. This labeling policy provides the
7 framework for consumer choice. It is our belief that
8 labeling of food products will occur in response to
9 consumer preference and as a result of competition in the
10 marketplace. If there is an identified market for food
11 products produced without biotechnology and customers
12 willing to pay a premium, labeling of food so produced
13 will quickly follow.
14 As it relates to mandatory labeling of foods and
15 food ingredients produced with biotechnology, WGA believes
16 that such a requirement would not serve the public
17 interest. Instead, WGA believes that mandatory labeling
18 would suggest a health risk where there is none; thus,
19 misleading consumers about the safety of these foods.
20 Agricultural biotechnology has the potential to
21 provide significant benefits to both the consumer and the
22 agricultural industry. As previously mentioned, WGA
23 represents the fresh produce industry. Value-added
24 innovations to meet consumer demands in recent years
25 include packaged salads, baby carrots, mixed vegetables

1 ready for stir frying, sliced mushrooms, and so forth.
2 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
3 [Applause.]
4 STATEMENT OF
5 MARTIN J. SPROUL, ESQ.
6 SPROUL LAW OFFICES
7 MR. SPROUL: Good afternoon. My name is Martin
8 Sproul, and I'm here today as an attorney, private
9 citizen; and also as a Natural Law Party candidate for
10 U.S. Congress in the Seventh Congressional District.
11 Genetic engineering has not only breached
12 species barriers, it has also blurred conceptual and
13 regulatory categories, weakening the regulatory mission.
14 When the FDA decided that food developed through
15 engineering was not different from food developed by other
16 breeding methods, that decision was political, not
17 scientific. The decision prejudged and biased
18 consideration of the issues. It imposed a false paradigm.
19 When before in history have we witnessed foods
20 rapidly morphing into drugs? Biotech has engineered more
21 addictive tobacco and opium and plans more nutraceuticals.
22 We are losing the distinction between food and
23 drug. The public has the right, and should have the
24 easily exercisable means to choose to consume foods that
25 is natures subtle combinations and balances of nutrients

1 with confidence that they are not surreptitious
2 drug-delivery systems, or that patchwork brainchildren of
3 folks in labs.
4 Functional public policy must be expressed in
5 language that corresponds to natural categories of the
6 human mind. Though technocrats may question the
7 scientific basis for distinctions between free and unfree
8 acts, between torts and crimes, between natural and
9 engineered, between foods and drugs. Such definite
10 categories have long proved useful and beneficial in
11 regulating human conduct. Bad government begins with
12 distortion of words and corruption of meaning.
13 I just have one comment I'd like to add. The
14 biotech industry here today has shown astounding cynicism
15 and hypocrisy insuring the attack on Dr. Fagan, for having
16 a business. As Dr. Cantelera (sic) pointed out, many Cal
17 professors have become partisan cheerleaders of the
18 biotech industry. So much for researcher objectivity.
19 It's a shame.
20 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
21 STATEMENT OF
22 BOB CANNARD
23 CANNARD FARMS
24 MR. CANNARD: Bob Cannard, Cannard Farms, an
25 organic farm.

1 Until the pollens of these modified crops can be
2 controlled from drift, this is the death knell of any
3 organic industry in the nation. It doesn't matter what
4 levels you talk about as being premissible, they'll soon
5 be exceeded.
6 The crops on your list of — radicchio, reaching
7 into the small vegetables, the chicoria family, the
8 radicchio, can be cross-pollinated to endives and
9 escarole, and all of the other small, very important,
10 nutritionally important, healthfully important winter
11 greens, the bitter winter greens of the Cichorium group,
12 will soon be taken from us as organic farmers. Whether
13 it's 3 years or whether it's 5 years, all various small
14 crops. Right now, we're working with corn and soy beans,
15 and wheat, the big ones; but as we allow, as we allow
16 patenting to continue, soon, all various small crops, all
17 the way down to the table beet and carrot, will be
18 patented. Genetic material will be introduced to them,
19 their pollens will drift to the seed stocks. We will no
20 longer have traditional food stocks available to us. It's
21 very easy to do. It's extremely difficult to clean things
22 up.
23 Now this is my position, my work. To try to
24 slow this down, it's been in trying to sponsor a petition
25 drive to get a measure on the ballot in California to

1 require food labeling, www.calrighttono. This is work you
2 should be doing.
3 Thank you.
4 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
5 [Applause.]
6 STATEMENT OF
7 MILTON P. GORDON
8 PROFESSOR OF BIOCHEMISTRY
9 UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
10 DR. GORDON: Good afternoon. I appreciate the
11 opportunity to talk to you.
12 I'm Milton Gordon. I'm a professor of
13 biochemistry, microbiology and ecological sciences at the
14 University of Washington. I'm also a member of the
15 Science Board for the Center of Molecular Biology in
16 Lahore, Pakistan. So I have some experience with
17 third-world countries and their problems.
18 I feel rather lonely and sad here because I
19 think I'm a minority of one. But the point I want to
20 make, in the limited time, is that there is not a clean
21 distinction between man-made genetic engineering and what
22 happens in nature. I don't understand, but for 13 or 14
23 years, there have been manuscripts in the press, from four
24 different laboratories, in Italy, France, Japan and the
25 United States, which show that solinacious plants, many of

1 them already contain genes from agrobacterium, the
2 organism that is used in genetic engineering. This
3 occurred maybe 10 to 40 million years ago, as we can tell
4 by the change in the DNA sequence. But the gene has been
5 preserved so much that, if it's put back into a mutant
6 bacterium, it will function. So you have a gene here
7 which will function in the plants and in the bacteria.
8 I think that's the best fact that we've heard
9 this afternoon about genetic engineering. It's done in
10 four laboratories.
11 Now there are some papers which have only done
12 in one laboratory, which indicate that there also are
13 agrobacterium in carrots and radish. Now supposing this
14 true, does that mean that we have to label all the carrots
15 and radishes in the grocery stores? What about all the
16 other foods? They've not been tested, to the best of my
17 knowledge. Do other foods, like oranges, turnips, celery
18 —
19 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
20 DR. GORDON: That's it? Thank you.
21 STATEMENT OF
22 ALAN MOORE
23 CITY OF BERKELEY BUTTERFLY GARDENERS ASSOCIATION
24 MS. MOORE: My name is Alan Moore and I'm here
25 representing the position of the Butterfly Gardeners

1 Association, the Patch Adams Peace and Justice Center, the
2 Mendocino Coast Environmental Center, the Bay Area
3 Citizens Circle, the Global Renaissance Alliance as a
4 group.
5 There was a recent *Time Magazine* article on the
6 World Trade Organization in Seattle called "Butterfly
7 Defenders." Our group includes David Brower, John
8 McConnell, Julia Butterfly, Neal Donald Wolf, Patch Adams,
9 Dr. Helen Caldicott, Rabbi Michael Lerner, and over 2000
10 other organizations and individuals.
11 Our government has been far too lax in approving
12 and failing to regulate a whole array of so-called
13 technological improvements that are namely focused on
14 improving the health of big corporations, rather than the
15 health and welfare of the American public. Such practices
16 has tainted our food, meat, poultry and milk supply with
17 antibiotics, growth hormones, and a whole host of
18 recombinant genetic materials, whose health effects and
19 consequences were mainly ignored, but are becoming
20 increasingly understood.
21 While we may have allowed you to pollute and
22 poison our food supply in the past, there is no way to
23 imagine that the American public will acquiesce when these
24 same technologies threaten butterflies.
25 When genetically altered crops, such as BT corn,

1 were shown recently at a Cornell study to kill Monarch
2 Butterfly caterpillars, it created a worldwide uproar that
3 stopped the exportation of these transgenic seeds to the
4 European Union and other countries. The deep rooted of
5 love of butterflies that raised the consciousness of the
6 world to realize the dangers that these multinational
7 corporations were threatening us with.
8 Dr. Chip Taylor, at the University of Kansas
9 Etymology Department, and director of Monarch Watch, a
10 group dedicated to the conservation of the Monarchs, was
11 cited as saying that the new corn and soy bean crops have
12 the potential to raise hell with Monarchs.
13 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
14 MR. MOORE: That's it. When we allow these
15 corporations and regulatory agencies, who are supposed to
16 protect us —
17 MR. LAKE: Sir, your tow minutes is up. Thank
18 you.
19 STATEMENT OF
20 SHEILA BARRY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
21 ALAMEDA COUNTY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
22 MS. BARRY: I'm Sheila Barry. I serve as the
23 executive officer for the Alameda County Resource
24 Conservation District. This district works with private
25 land owners promoting soil and water conservation.

1 Today, I want to make a statement regarding the
2 importance of biotechnology, including genetic
3 engineering, in providing solutions for conservation of
4 our soil, land, air, water, wildlife and people.
5 We have enormous challenges ahead of us in
6 conserving our natural resources. Most notably, we have
7 conflicting desires and needs in regards to the production
8 of our food and conservation of our resources. These
9 conflicts are evident with just a quick glimpse at any
10 newspaper: (1), we have a growing population that
11 demanding cheap, high-quality, safe food; (2) people
12 generally want less pesticide and herbicide used in the
13 production of their food; some are even willing and able
14 to pay for it; and (3) urban growth and public policy are
15 forcing food to be grown on less land.
16 For example: The Silicon Valley, just south of
17 us, used to be known as the Valley of Hearts Delights,
18 when, instead of software and semiconductor companies, and
19 houses, the valley was covered with orchards.
20 In terms of public policy, policies like the
21 Endangered Species Act, Cal Fed Open Space Protection
22 Programs are taking lands our of agriculture production.
23 So how can we continue to meet the public's conflicting
24 demands? In short, how can we produce more food on less
25 land with less chemicals?

1 We are wise to look towards biotechnology for a
2 solution. And as with any new technology, we must
3 proceed with caution. I want to encourage you to
4 continue to take every step to insure that the public is
5 thoughtfully informed. We must be thoughtful and
6 responsible, for wouldn't it be an irony if in our zeal to
7 protect our environment and our children's children from
8 unknown risk associated with GE foods they starved to
9 death.
10 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
11 [Applause.]
12 STATEMENT OF
13 GREGORY FRANKEL, PROJECT COORDINATOR
14 THE GREEN LINK, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
15 BERKELEY FOOD POLICY COUNCIL
16 MR. FRANKEL: Hello! My name is Gregory
17 Frankel. I'm the project coordinator for a project called
18 "The Green Link," which is funded by the California
19 Department of Pesticide Regulation to provide education on
20 ecologically based pest management. It's run through the
21 University of California at Berkeley.
22 I want to commend you all on having open panel
23 discussions, and well-rounded discussions. I hope it's
24 not a smoke screen. I hope you take it all to light.
25 I just want to say, right off the bat, that I

1 support labeling of products that contain genetically
2 modified organisms. I'm having trouble figuring out why
3 the GE corporations are so concerned with this. To echo
4 earlier remarks, if they're so proud of their product, I
5 don't understand why they're concerned about the labeling
6 issues and the incremental costs that would be associated
7 with that. It seems like there's a significant amount of
8 fear behind their opposition to it. And many of them are
9 supporting the 1992 study that you all put out. Except
10 that, the bottom line, most of the research that has been
11 done on this issue has been done since then. So to refer
12 back to the 1992 findings of scientific evidence seems
13 like it's a little outdated, since it's been such a new
14 topic of discussion.
15 Another point that I was having trouble coming
16 to grips with was that Dr. Maryanski said earlier that
17 it's the goal of the FDA to be concerned with not only the
18 human health risks, but also the ecological risks. But he
19 went through the discussion of the testing and criteria
20 that EPA goes through on the consultation, it talked a lot
21 about nutritional testing, allergy testing and toxin
22 testing; but it didn't really have any — didn't show any
23 discussion of the testing criteria on ecological risks.
24 Also, it seems like a lot of people, farmers
25 especially, are talking about the benefits that pesticide

1 reduction has come with these GE products. But, in the
2 long-term, this benefits —
3 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
4 STATEMENT OF
5 NANCY EVANS
6 COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTANT
7 THE BREAST CANCER FUND
8 MS. EVANS: My name is Nancy Evans. I'm a
9 health science writer, an environmentalist, a mother, a
10 grandmother, and a woman living with breast cancer.
11 I'm deeply concerned about bioengineered foods,
12 and I am angry about the disinformation the biotech
13 industry is force feeding the American people. They
14 promote bioengineered foods as the only hope for feeding
15 the world. It seems to me, however, that bioengineered
16 foods were developed to feed the coffers of transnational
17 corporations.
18 Our food supply is already contaminated by
19 hormones in milk and meat, by antibiotics in poultry, and
20 by pesticides on produce. The FDA has permitted this
21 contamination, so it isn't surprising that the so-called
22 life science corporations are not required to show
23 independent scientific evidence that GMOs pose no risk to
24 human health or to the environment. What will it take to
25 get FDA to protect our food supply from corporate control

1 and contamination?

2 GMOs are stealth ingredients in cereals, snack
3 foods, infant formula, pancake mix and pet food. Will
4 these stealth ingredients further fuel the cancer epidemic
5 in America? We don't know. Will they produce
6 life-threatening allergic reactions in the 5 million
7 American children who suffer from asthma? We don't know.

8 The majority of GMOs have been developed to
9 withstand higher levels of pesticide spraying or to
10 produce their own insecticides. Will these foods endanger
11 more children's health than already compromised? We don't
12 know.

13 If Americans knew the potential risks of
14 bioengineered foods, they would not buy them. That's why
15 industry doesn't want labeling, but labeling is only a
16 first step. We need to halt the production of
17 bioengineered foods until scientific evidence shows them
18 to be safe for us and for the environment.

19 The 20th Century has been characterized by three
20 developments of great political importance: The growth of
21 democracy; the growth of corporate power; and the growth
22 of propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power
23 against democracy.

24 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.

25 [Applause.]

1 STATEMENT OF
2 KARA COSBY
3 MEDIA RELATIONS MANAGER
4 INTERNATIONAL FOOD INFORMATION COUNCIL
5 MS. COSBY: Hello. I'm Kara Cosby with the
6 International Food Information Council.
7 It's important that we all provide as much
8 credible information as possible to all consumers who want
9 that information. FDA does play a critical role in
10 communicating information about the safety of food
11 biotechnology to the general public.
12 Consumer attitudinal research conducted by IFIC,
13 and other organizations, indicate that the most credible
14 sources for food safety and nutrition communication are
15 health professional organizations, physicians, dietitians,
16 academic scientists, farmers, and government agencies,
17 such as the FDA and CDC. Priorities for information
18 dissemination should be consistent with both national
19 goals for food safety education, and the relative health
20 risks to the general public. In this regard, it is
21 important that we not let perceived risks, absent of any
22 evidence of actual risk from agriculture biotechnology,
23 distort the important Presidential Food Safety Initiative
24 targeted to actual risks from microbrial pathogens in our
25 food supply. We should not minimize legitimate questions

1 or concerns about food biotechnology. Yet, we should not
2 be driven by opinion that we know is less than informed.
3 Our consumer surveys have consistently shown
4 that consumers with the highest level of education have
5 been most likely to support food biotechnology. When
6 consumers have solid science-based information, they make
7 the right decisions. A majority of consumers support the
8 benefits of food biotechnology when they are clearly
9 explained.
10 We look forward to working with the FDA and our
11 partners in the health professional and academic
12 communities to provide accurate and comprehensive
13 information that will help consumers make informed food
14 choices.
15 Thank you.
16 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
17 [Applause.]
18 STATEMENT OF
19 JANET BROWN, PROGRAM OFFICER
20 CENTER FOR ECOLITERACY
21 MS. BROWN: My name is Janet Brown, and I'm a
22 program officer at the Center for Ecoliteracy, for food
23 systems and liaison to the Food Systems Project in
24 Berkeley, recently designated one of four pilot projects
25 of the USDA, for linking farms to schools. I'm the

1 founder and chair of the Marin Food Policy Council and a
2 California certified organic farmer.
3 I bring with me a resolution adopted by Berkeley
4 City Council on December 7, supporting the establishment
5 of federal regulation to ban growing, disseminating and
6 marketing products genetically engineered until they have
7 been proven safe for human consumption.
8 In addition, I've a resolution from the Berkeley
9 Board of Education adopted on December 1, supporting the
10 ban and calling for implementation of a transparent system
11 of assessment that requires a demonstration of reasonable
12 certainty of the benefits which greatly exceed the cost,
13 and a shift of the burden of proof and cost to the
14 manufacturer.
15 These may be the first resolutions of their kind
16 in the United States, but you and I both know they're not
17 the last.
18 From the Marin Food Policy Council, we take this
19 opportunity to register our strong concern regarding the
20 permissive atmosphere which allows an essentially
21 unregulated and disturbingly disintegrated science of
22 genetic engineering to operate in the absence of liability
23 constraints. Genetic engineering is at odds with the
24 sustainable agriculture. It seeks to intervene in the
25 natural process to undermine and move against the great

1 forces of ecology, choosing, instead, to gamble on the
2 short-term cleverness of human ingenuity over faith in the
3 infallibility of nature. At this time, many concerned
4 citizens of the United States are uniting with citizens
5 from countries all over the world in questioning whether
6 this technology can be allowed to go forward in the face
7 of mounting doubt, danger and opposition.
8 Were the Food and Drug Administration to employ
9 precautionary principle, rather than the risk management
10 model —
11 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
12 STATEMENT OF
13 RON PETERSON
14 MR. PETERSON: I appreciate the opportunity to
15 speak, although I think it's much too belated. I speak
16 for my family, the Peterson Family, and the hundreds
17 outside not given entrance, and millions worldwide not
18 given voice.
19 My family relies on organically grown crops for
20 our nutrition and health. Our source of sustenance is
21 being threatened by cross-contamination, genetic drift
22 from GE crops. We demand that the poisoning of our food
23 source cease immediately.
24 We demand an immediate 5-year moratorium on GE
25 foods, and demand long-term mandatory independent testing.

1 We do not trust the current, all-to-cozy, revolving door
2 Monsanto-FDA tandem. We demand that we first determine
3 the safety of GE, GMO foods by long-term independent
4 testing; and only then label those Frankenfoods. We
5 demand that all GE, GMO foods be pulled from market
6 shelves immediately until proven safe.
7 We believe that GE, GMO methodologies are
8 responsible for decreased nutrition, superweeds,
9 biological pollution, dying Monarchs, increased chemical
10 use, allergies and antibiotics resistance, and
11 compromising BT use by organic farmers.
12 My family is being robbed of nutritional
13 supplements, such as Vitamin E, because of soy-based GMO
14 contamination. We will not be the guinea pigs for greed
15 driven corporate pirates.
16 We join with our brothers and sisters in Europe,
17 Japan, and many other countries in rejecting these
18 untested Frankenfoods. FDA, do your job and protect your
19 citizens. Your own scientists warned of dangerous toxins
20 in GE foods. They were significant health risks. Do your
21 job now and listen to your own scientists, scientists not
22 bought and paid for by the self-serving, greed-driven
23 motives of Monsanto and its coconspirators..
24 Thank you.
25 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.

1 [Applause.]

2 STATEMENT OF

3 CHRIS BRINEGAR, PH.D.

4 PROFESSOR, MICROBIOLOGY

5 DIRECTOR, BIOTECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE

6 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

7 DR. BRINEGAR: Hi! My name is Chris Brinegar.
8 I'm director of Biotechnology Education and Research
9 Institute at San Jose State University. I'm also a
10 professor of Botany and Molecular Biology there, too.
11 I've have a Masters Degree in Food Science and
12 Ph.D. in Crop Physiology, and three years experience at an
13 agricultural biotechnology company. And as a professor,
14 I've taught molecular biology for 13 years, and I've
15 directed our Biotechnology Institute for the past 5 years.
16 So, speaking from almost 25 years of experience,
17 I truly believe that biotechnology has the potential to
18 improve the world's food supply, but not the way it's been
19 applied so far. Today, my biggest fear is that the
20 public's perception of bioengineered foods has been
21 poisoned by regulatory agencies and companies and by their
22 refusal to educate the public on this issue. This
23 educational void has been filled largely by British
24 tabloid journalism, which has led to the current backlash
25 against genetically modified organisms.

1 In 1996, I saw that the FDA was doing nothing to
2 educate consumers on this issue. So, over the next two
3 years, I gave more than 20 lectures, all over the country,
4 with the goal of informing people about bioengineered
5 foods. At least 90 percent of all the people I talked to
6 didn't know that they'd already eaten products from
7 bioengineered crops, and they were ticked off that they
8 were not told about it regardless of how they felt on the
9 issue. People want to know what their food is
10 bioengineered for the same reasons they want to know
11 whether a food is kosher, organic, or vegetarian, or
12 whether their tuna is dolphin free, or if running shoes
13 have been made in third-world sweat shops. What one eats
14 or buys is often an extension of what one believes. And
15 just as some people believe that eating animals is morally
16 wrong, other people may believe that swapping genes
17 between the kingdoms of life is morally wrong. And they
18 should not be forced to unknowingly eat transgenic
19 products.
20 My specific advice is this: Label all
21 bioengineered foods by putting an asterisk next to the
22 affected ingredient —
23 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
24 DR. BRINEGAR: Damn that was a fast ttwo
25 minutes.

1 [Laughter.]

2 Well, then, you won't get my specific

3 recommendation.

4 MR. LAKE: You can submit it for the record.

5 STATEMENT OF

6 WALTER EPP

7 MR. EPP: If you think this is a scientific

8 issue, you are missing the point completely. Under

9 capitalism, you get the reward if you assume the risk.

10 Under socialism, the public gets both the reward and risk.

11 When industry gets the reward and the public gets the

12 risk, we have a prescription for disaster. Without

13 consequences, there's nothing to keep actors responsible.

14 Tampering with the genetic fabric of life is a completely

15 different order of risk.

16 Toxic chemicals and radioactive elements

17 disintegrate over time, so there's a limit to the total

18 damage. Mutant genes could spread and reproduce forever

19 with no limit to the damage. We're talking about

20 unprecedented types of recklessness.

21 Freedom is the ability to make choices. If

22 there's no labeling, there's no choice. If there's no

23 choice, there's no freedom. To call this a free market is

24 a fraud. It's a rigged market.

25 We will know the FDA is doing its job when it

1 does the following: All studies regarding to health and
2 environmental consequences are published on the internet,
3 with funding sources and employment histories disclosed.
4 Any company that keeps anything secret is prohibited from
5 selling. For the public to make informed decisions, it
6 must have free access to all information. No product
7 approvals based on data produced by people affiliated with
8 the producer or other conflict of interest.
9 Require full liability from industry for all
10 damage from genetic engineering. Since damage could
11 exceed the ability of companies to pay, this will require
12 posting a bond. Since the damage from self-reproducing
13 genes could last a million years, the size of this bond
14 would be spectacular. If companies, and their CEOs, do
15 not accept liability without possibility of bankruptcy,
16 then they do not believe the benefits are worth the risk,
17 so why should we?
18 This criterion is more relevant than a hundred
19 foot pile of scientific studies. Anything less than these
20 terms is an astronomical subsidy.
21 An industry poll shows 93 percent public support
22 for labeling. The timing and procedures of this meeting
23 maximized convenience for corporations and maximized
24 inconvenience to the public. If the FDA continues to
25 serve corporate interests and subvert the public

1 interests, it renounces its claim to legitimate authority
2 and leaves it to the public to figure out some other way
3 to regain control. In a democracy, the public decides by
4 criteria of its chosing.
5 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
6 MR. EPP: — scientific or not.
7 STATEMENT OF
8 SHIRLEY STUART
9 RETIRED, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
10 MS. STUART: My name is Shirley Stuart. I'm
11 speaking today as a consumer.
12 The mandate of the FDA seems to have been turned
13 180 degrees. The FDA is supposed to stand between us and
14 the avarice of big business. Monsanto, Norvartis, and the
15 other agri-giants, have developed GMO products not out of
16 an altruistic wish to feed the world, but to make money.
17 Plants are being irrevocably changed. Many of the
18 resulting products have not been tested. And, yet, you're
19 asking us to eat them without our knowledge.
20 The focus of some of the panel members here
21 seems to be not to answer questions, but how to get us to
22 stop asking them. The FDA has simply accepted biotech
23 industry assurances that their products pose no threat to
24 our health. They're being considered as no different from
25 ordinary foods, so no special testing has been required.

1 Some scientists are concerned that the enhanced
2 or souped-up promoters used to insert foreign genes into
3 cells may cause cancer. Questions that bacterial
4 resistance to antibiotics may be made worse by mark
5 routines, used in the splicing process, have also been
6 raised. Some experts have suggested that old diseases may
7 acquire new characteristics and new diseases may be
8 created as a result of these processes.
9 To say that gene splicing is only an extension
10 of traditional agricultural practices is ludicrous.
11 Cross-species genetic combinations could never occur
12 without this process. How, for instance, would a gene
13 from a flounder get into a tomato?
14 I am opposed to genetic modification of food;
15 but, if it's going to be done, the products must be
16 labeled. I don't want to eat tomatoes with fish genes,
17 and I don't want to eat corn and potatoes that have
18 bacteria and virus genes spliced into them. The rest of
19 the world has been saying, "No," and we in America have
20 the right to say "No," too.
21 Thank you.
22 [Applause.]
23 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
24 //
25 //

1 STATEMENT OF

2 C. S. PRAKASH, Ph.D.

3 PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

4 TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

5 DR. PRAKASH: My name is C. S. Prakash, and I'm
6 from Tuskegee University.

7 My research is in developing nutritionally new
8 crop plants, and I work specifically on peanut. Much of
9 my work also involves training of many scientists in
10 developing countries. And I am from a developing country
11 myself, from India.

12 As a plant breeders, and also as a molecular
13 biologist, I have been fortunate to know how some of these
14 products are developed and how agriculture has evolved.
15 And my belief is that risk is necessarily a function of
16 the nature of the product and not necessarily the process
17 in which it was developed.

18 I have heard a lot of mention of precautionary
19 principle mentioned here, and our being — the audience
20 here warning you about some of the risks involved. And I
21 just wanted to say that, if you were to invoke the
22 precautionary principle, if you were to be sitting here
23 about a hundred or two hundred years ago and asked the
24 same types of questions of all of the critics of
25 biotechnology about the safety of the GM foods, in this

1 country you would be eating cranberries, blueberries and
2 artichoke. Because every other crop has been introduced
3 from somewhere else. And every other crop you can ask
4 the same questions, whether it is potatoes, or soy bean,
5 or corn, and you could come up with some risk factor to
6 prevent the use of those crops here. And the same goes
7 with the traditionally improved crop plants for which even
8 a small chromosome segment that is introduced from a wild
9 potato introduces nearly 1,000 genes for just one gene
10 that we are trying to introduce, and for which we have no
11 knowledge what those genes do.
12 And, again, what happens today here, the
13 positions that you've taken, FDA, here, has really a
14 cascading effect on the rest of the world, especially in
15 developing countries. And, you know, at the end of this
16 century, the technology will still have the prospect of
17 about a billion people who earn less than one dollar a
18 day, and who go hungry everyday. And biotechnology may
19 not be the proper technology —
20 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
21 DR. PRAKASH: Thank you.
22 STATEMENT OF
23 MAUREEN TERNUS, M.S., R.D.
24 FOOD AND NUTRITION COMMUNICATIONS
25 MS. TERNUS: My name is Maureen Ternus. I'm a

1 registered dietitian with a nutrition communications
2 consulting practice here in the Bay Area. I work closely
3 with public and health professionals.
4 One area of my business includes manning a
5 nutrition hot line. And, ironically, I get very few
6 questions regarding biotechnology. Most consumers are
7 more concerned about the safety of the food supply and
8 pesticides, in particular. One of the greatest benefits
9 of plant biotechnology is the reduction in the use of
10 pesticides and insecticides.
11 From a health standpoint, biotechnology can help
12 improve the food supply by making foods more nutritious.
13 For example: Using this technology, we can add protein to
14 foods in developing countries with high rates of
15 malnutrition. Other opportunities include the production
16 of grains, fruits and vegetables with more vitamins and
17 minerals. In fact, many developing countries are already
18 benefiting from newly-developed high-Vitamin A rice.
19 The position of the American Dietetic
20 Association, which represents 70,000 registered
21 dietitians, is that biotechnology has the potential to be
22 useful in enhancing the quality and nutritional value in
23 the variety of food available for human consumption. This
24 is especially important when you consider the fact that
25 the world's population is expected to double in the next

1 40 to 50 years, increasing food production needs by 250
2 percent. Plant biotechnology can help meet increased
3 global food and fiber demands while promoting sustainable
4 farming methods.
5 As with any new technology, lack of credible
6 information can result in questions and concerns. Instead
7 of spending so much time and money debating whether or not
8 to use biotechnology, more resources should be spent on
9 educating the public. Most consumers are so removed from
10 the farm these days that few understand the process by
11 which produce, for example, gets the field into the
12 supermarket, much less how this new technology works.
13 As a health professional, I feel biotechnology
14 is an important tool in providing numerous health and
15 environmental benefits.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
18 [Applause.]
19 STATEMENT OF GUY A. CARDINEAU, Ph.D.
20 GLOBAL LEADER, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT,
21 OUTPUT AGRICULTURE, DOW AGROSCIENCES
22 DR. CARDINEAU: Good afternoon.
23 My name is Guy Cardineau, and I'm currently
24 global leader for Output Agriculture R&D, at Dow
25 AgroSciences in San Diego. For over 16 years, I've worked

1 in the field of ag biotechnology, and have been fortunate
2 to have been involved in the exploration of the tremendous
3 opportunities that new plant varieties offer us in
4 addressing environmental, nutritional, and other problems
5 worldwide.
6 I'm here today to stress the commitment of Dow
7 AgroSciences to thorough and continuous testing of all new
8 plant varieties that we develop. We begin assessing
9 potential toxicity, allergenicity and environmental safety
10 concerns as soon as the desired traits or genes are
11 identified. We continue environmental and human health
12 safety testing as the gene is transferred to seed and
13 planted in the field. The resulting new plant varieties
14 are evaluated against their traditional plant variety
15 throughout the period of trait integration to assess the
16 effect of the modification. All collected data is
17 submitted to FDA, EPA, and USDA, as appropriate, which
18 form a coordinated framework for regulatory review. We
19 may conduct additional tests depending on our assessments
20 or from evaluations that these agencies make about our
21 submitted data.
22 While these new products are derived from
23 proteins that appear in nature and human and animal
24 toxicities are not expected, we recognize they must
25 nevertheless be investigated with both traditional and

1 emerging risk assessment methods. The agencies are
2 prodigious in these reviews and work to anticipate real
3 problems that might occur in any situation. We believe
4 the coordinated framework of review allows for numerous
5 eyes, from various perspectives, to examine the safety and
6 health data on allergenicity and toxicity and
7 environmental impact.
8 I'd like to conclude with four points:
9 First, we support the coordinated agency
10 framework. It's appropriate and effective in the
11 oversight of biotech products.
12 Secondly, Dow AgroSciences takes product
13 stewardship very, very seriously. Our company is working
14 to employ the most modern risk assessment methods to
15 evaluate the new wave of novel products.
16 Lastly, we expected this wonderful science will
17 permit us to use plants to produce novel products that
18 will play important roles in medicine, fuel production,
19 farming, food and fiber production, and to benefit the
20 environment.
21 Thank you, for your time.
22 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
23 [Applause.]
24 //
25 //

1 STATEMENT OF
2 ARIELLE LEVINE, GRADUATE STUDENT
3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
4 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
5 MS. LEVINE: My name is Arielle Levine, and I'm
6 here to speak as a concerned graduate student from the
7 University of California, Berkeley, College of Natural
8 Resources.
9 Last year, my college signed a research
10 agreement with Novartis, a major agricultural biotech
11 corporation. This alliance sparked tremendous debate
12 about issues surrounding biotechnology and the future
13 direction of reseach at our university. A good deal of
14 funding at Berkeley, $25 million, in fact, is directed
15 towards developing biotechnology. However, little to no
16 funding is directed towards questioning biotechnology or
17 developing sustainable alternatives, such as organic
18 agriculture or integrated pest management.
19 A few large agro business companies have created
20 pressures to get new products on the market as quickly as
21 possible, before we know their possible ecological,
22 economic and health ramifications. Research on genetic
23 engineering is very one-sides, and little is known about
24 the potential dangers of biotechnology to our society.
25 As we heard this morning, there is little

1 scientific consensus. In fact, there were Berkeley
2 faculty and students rallying outside the building today
3 both in support of and against biotechnology. If so much
4 controversy can be found in a major university, like
5 Berkeley, it is clear that we can not yet wholeheartedly
6 embrace biotechnology in all of its implications.
7 I, and the students for responsible research at
8 UC-Berkeley, advocate taking a precautionary approach
9 towards genetically engineered foods, and recommend that,
10 first, more research needs to be conducted on the
11 potential negative effects of GE foods. Looking at the
12 potential benefits is already very well funded by large
13 corporations. But there are sparse funds available to look
14 at the potential hazards, or to develop sustainable
15 alternatives.
16 Second, the FDA should mandate industry labeling
17 of GE foods. The public's concerns are valid and they
18 have the right to make an informed choice about the food
19 they consume. If these foods are as safe as their
20 advocates say they are, they should have no problem with
21 the public's right to know. We believe that this
22 precautionary approach is the only responsible approach
23 for the FDA to take, given the paucity of research being
24 conducted and how little is known about the potential
25 hazards og GE foods.

1 Thanks.

2 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.

3 [Applause.]

4 STATEMENT OF

5 MICH B. HEIN, PRESIDENT

6 EPLCYTE PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.

7 MR. HEIN: My name is Mich Hein. I'm the

8 president of EPlycyte Pharmaceutical, a small

9 biotechnology company in San Diego, California, which is

10 based on using transgenic plants to produce pharmaceutical

11 proteins.

12 I'd like to thank the FDA for this opportunity

13 for all of us to meet here, and to commend you on your

14 endurance for this day, and for the two meetings.

15 We produce pharmaceuticals in plants because

16 plants are the most efficient producers of protein on the

17 planet. There isn't any question about that. It's the

18 reason it's the basis for our food supply. It's also the

19 basis of our economy. You've already instituted protocols

20 for labeling for nutrition, and we, as an industry and as

21 a company, support the 1992 FDA protocol for science-based

22 material labeling of products.

23 We believe that the ability to produce proteins

24 in plants, for pharmaceutical purposes, will also — would

25 somebody please shut that off?

1 We believe that the evolution of this technology
2 will lead to a blurring of the lines between
3 pharmaceuticals and plants. And I think Dr. Johnson
4 alluded to that earlier. Our health is very much tied to
5 our food supply.
6 I'd like, in closing, to make this single point:
7 That there is a lot of fear and a lot ignorance out there,
8 and a lot of that is justified. Because we don't know
9 what we're getting into in many cases. However, we need
10 facts and we need information in order to eliminate that
11 fear and ignorance. And I would echo Dr. Gordon's
12 surprise and his dismay in that many of the
13 representations here, based on the miscegnation of genes
14 amongst organisms, has a very clear precedent, that there
15 are many, many genes that have been transferred between
16 kingdoms and amongst organisms that have been done so
17 without the help of human hands. In fact, it's the
18 ability of us to recognize that, that has allowed us to
19 make many of the transgenic organisms and plants that we
20 have made.
21 Thank you.
22 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
23 [Applause.]
24 //
25 //

1 STATEMENT OF
2 MIKE PHILLIPS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
3 FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL, BIOTECHNOLGOY INDUSTRY
4 ORGANIZATION
5 MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Mike Phillips, with the —
6 I'm the executive director for Food and Agriculture, for
7 the Biotechnology Industry Organization. I thank you for
8 allowing us to make comments today.
9 BIO represents over 850 biotechnology companies
10 and academic institutions. FDA is to be commended for its
11 1992 policy and the way it has been implemented. There is
12 really no issue with regard to food safety in the food
13 derived from crops improved through biotechnology. And
14 even the activists, who take the time to read and
15 understand FDA's policy, also recognize the food safety is
16 a nonissue.
17 BIO supports the consumer right to have
18 information that allows them to make informed choices
19 regarding the foods that they eat. FDA's 1992 policy for
20 biotechnology foods and ingredients provides consumers
21 with everything the activists have asked for, except the
22 ability to sow confusion and mislead consumers with
23 government blessing. Choice is provided. If a consumer
24 wants to buy food not derived from enhanced crops, they
25 can buy organic and also pay the higher cost. If they

1 want accurate and reliable information on health and
2 nutrition, that is mandated by law. If they want to know
3 if their personal preferences in regard to genetic
4 modification has been met, companies are free to meet
5 those preferences provided there is sufficient consumer
6 demand.
7 We agree with FDA's implementation of the 1992
8 policy that requires labeling for significant changes,
9 including nutrients or the introduction of allergens, and,
10 specifically, that the common and usual name for the
11 ingredient should identify the change. The Food, Drug and
12 Cosmetic Act allows food producers to provide choice
13 through voluntary label statements as long as labels are
14 truthful and not misleading. If food companies were to
15 pursue voluntary labeling, FDA would need to be an
16 integral part of establishing uniform guidelines or
17 criteria to insure that consumers could relay on labeling
18 for factual and accurate information.
19 Changing policy to require special labeling for
20 foods derived from biotechnology could impact
21 significantly consumers perception of the safety of these
22 foods and undermine the confidence consumers presently
23 have in the information for which they look to food
24 labels.
25 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.

1 [Applause.]

2 STATEMENT OF

3 MATTHEW METZ

4 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

5 MR. METZ: My name is Matthew Metz. I'm a
6 doctoral student in the UC-Berkeley Plant Biology
7 Department.

8 First of all, I do not have an agenda fueled by
9 disgruntled feelings of disenfranchisement from the
10 scientific community. No protest rallier fed me lunch, or
11 ego stroking today. I'm part of a coalition of concerned
12 scientists interested in public having the capability of
13 making informed consumer choices. These choices should
14 not be warped by techophobia coming from one end of this
15 melodrama, nor the deprivation of information that seems
16 to be evolving from the other end. Every melodrama needs
17 a villain, and I think that this debate over the
18 technology should really avoid being thrust into such a
19 position.

20 One other item.

21 Nothing is absolutely safe, and I think that the
22 insistence on proving absolute safety in the food product
23 is merely a filibuster against its reaching the market at
24 all. Labels will occur, driven by market demand.
25 Mandatory labeling will not be necessary, nor does it seem

1 to be the mandate of the FDA. However, it will seem to be
2 very critical for the FDA to play a strong role in
3 governing how these labels are worded and on what products
4 they're placed. The FDA has a history of regulating food,
5 drug and cosmetics so that they are not — they do not
6 prevent consumer misconception.
7 During the second panel discussion, food
8 irradiation was mentioned. European markets have long
9 benefited from the increased safety, shelf life, plus
10 reduced storage costs of this technology. The U.S.
11 markets have not benefited from this technology in any
12 substantial way, partly because the labeling standards did
13 not promote understanding of the technological benefits
14 and appeared to be cautionary versus informative.
15 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
16 [Applause.]
17 STATEMENT OF
18 KEVIN DANAHER, Ph.D.
19 PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TRANSFAIR USA
20 MR. DANAHER: Good evening. My name is Kevin
21 Danaher. I got my Ph.D. from the University of
22 California. I'm president of the Board of Directors of
23 TransFair USA, which is the fair trade labeling
24 organization for the United States, part of FLO, Fair
25 Trade Labeling Organizations International, the largest

1 international network of fair trade labeling
2 organizations.
3 I want to put this in the largest historical
4 context I can. It took centuries to achieve the
5 separation of church and state. We are now in the middle
6 of a struggle to separate corporations and the state in
7 order to have real democracy. So the question is not
8 about science or technology. It's about who rules. Is it
9 the citizens or is it the corporations?
10 America was the first nation to establish the
11 principle that sovereignty, which means open political
12 authority, resides in We, The People. And we are a beacon
13 to democratic movements around the world because of that
14 founding of our country. Abe Lincoln, in the Gettysburg
15 Address, referred to government of the people, by the
16 people, for the people. He didn't say of the
17 corporations, by the corporations, for the corporations.
18 In fact, corporations and profit maximization does not
19 appear in the Constitution, the Declaration of
20 Independence, or any of our founding documents.
21 So the question is: Are the people sovereign
22 citizens who should rule, or are we guinea pigs to the
23 latest round of corporate technology?
24 I apologize if this sounds condescending, but
25 the FDA's central responsibility, in my mind, is to

1 protect the citizen taxpayers, not to protect corporate
2 profits. So the recommendations of TransFair USA, Global
3 Exchange, and many other activists organizations, is: We
4 need more democracy. As many speakers on both sides of
5 this has said, we need the facts to get out. Let's open
6 up the process. Let's have public debate. Let's go on
7 Night Line, let's go out in all the media, and debate the
8 issue and may the best argument win. And we need labeling
9 information so the citizens can make informed decisions
10 about the kind of commodities they want to purchase.
11 Thank you very much.
12 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
13 [Applause.]
14 STATEMENT OF
15 MICHAEL STRAUSS
16 INNOVATIVE MARKETING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE,
17 BEYOND ORGANIC
18 MR. STRAUSS: Hi! Mu name is Michael Strauss.
19 I'm a public relations consultant and the former marketing
20 director of our family farm, the first organic dairy farm
21 in the Western United States. I'm not here in any
22 official capacity, for the family or the dairy.
23 FDA labeling on RVST placed an unfair economic
24 burden on dairy processors, who choose not to use it, by
25 not requiring mandatory labeling for those who do. I

1 know. I've run into that repeatedly in my previous work.
2 The apparent revolving door policy, which
3 allowed RVST labeling regulations to be developed by a
4 person who was formerly, and is currently now, a Monsanto
5 employee, raises significant credibility issues. When all
6 is said and done, this process is built on trust. Until
7 conflict-of-interest issues can be fully resolved, until
8 trust can be restored, the public, all of our right to
9 know, must be honored. Mandatory labeling, by
10 manufacturers using GMO ingredients, is merely the first
11 step to restoring the public trust.
12 Thank you.
13 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
14 [Applause.]
15 STATEMENT OF
16 SALLY FOX
17 COTTON BREEDER, FOX FIBER
18 MS. FOX: Good afternoon. My name is Sally Fox.
19 I am a traditional cotton breeder. I breed cotton that
20 grows in color, and I grow it organically. It's name is
21 Fox Fiber, not Frankenfiber.
22 I want nothing — I am beyond belief, aggravated
23 and shocked by the people who hold Ph.D.s, who, in this
24 room today, have told people that genetic engineering is
25 simply the next step beyond plant breeding.

1 I want to, if I only say one thing to you today,
2 I want you to know that there is no resemblance whatsoever
3 between real, traditional plant breeding, that has brought
4 us all the food and fiber that created the civilization
5 that we enjoy or dislike — depending on our views — but
6 it has all been brought to us by traditional plant
7 breeders. And this anomaly, this current craze that has
8 taken over the scientific community, the quote "scientific
9 community," in the United States is the most treacherous
10 threat to real science in our society that I believe we
11 have ever come across.
12 I know we only have two minutes, so I will — I
13 had brought lots of data that I've analyzed in terms of
14 the BT crops, the crops that are producing the BT toxin.
15 I've looked at the evidence that was supplied to the EPA,
16 and I find it equally lacking in logic. Nothing was
17 actually tested with the true plant — well, not nothing
18 — very few tests were actually conducted with the actual
19 toxin that's expressed by the plant. All the
20 registrations and the exemption from tolerance testing
21 that the EPA gave the BT plants were based on the natural
22 bacteria from which it came. I used to be, my day job
23 before I could afford to be an independent plant breeder,
24 was as a fermentation microbologist and later as a quality
25 control supervisor at —

1 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.

2 [Applause.]

3 STATEMENT OF

4 REBECCA KAPLAN

5 GREEN PARTY

6 MS. KAPLAN: Good afternoon. Thank you for your

7 time and your attention. I know it's getting late.

8 My name is Rebecca Kaplan. First, I'd like to

9 convey the Green Party, which has recently calling for a

10 moratorium on genetically engineered food until such time

11 as full, complete, safety testing is completed. And

12 regardless of the results of any safety testing, is

13 calling for labeling of all genetically modified

14 organisms.

15 Some points about what's going on.

16 I've heard a lot of people talk about how

17 they're excited about genetically modified organisms, how

18 they find them useful in specific applications. None of

19 that justifies at all why we should me made to eat them

20 without our consent. These people that are excited about

21 them and they want them, let them buy them. But to not

22 have them be labeled violates every core principle of

23 democracy.

24 It also violates every free market principle

25 going back to Adam Smith, which is premised upon people

1 making informed choices of their own free will about what
2 they do and don't want. Even those who think that
3 genetically engineered foods are great should not oppose
4 their being labeled. If they thought they were great,
5 they would promote them being labeled and tell people that
6 they're great, and let people know where to find them.
7 Additionally, I think there is a lack of taking
8 into account the big picture. Even if one specific
9 organism doesn't have a proven health impact, people
10 should have the right to follow their personal, ethical or
11 religious beliefs. Right now, there is no kosher
12 labeling, or labeling for other dietary requirements on
13 raw fruits and vegetables that are in the supermarket.
14 Now that there is genetic engineering, we're going to have
15 to assume that it's all not kosher. To prohibit people
16 from being able to practice their religious and ethical
17 beliefs is unacceptable in a multicultural society.
18 Finally, this cannot be undone. The United
19 States did not phase out lead in paint until years after
20 Europe did, even though it was proven to be dangerous,
21 because they were beholden to the corporate profits. And
22 I imagine many of you know how difficult lead abatement
23 is.
24 MR. LAKE: Thank you, ma'am.
25 MS. KAPLAN: It's nothing compared to trying to

1 abate genetically engineered organism in the wild.
2 Thank you.
3 MR. LAKE: Thank you.
4 STATEMENT OF
5 JOHN DUARTE
6 DUARTE NURSERY
7 MR. DUARTE: Hello. I'm John Duarte, from
8 Duarte Nursery and Dry Feed Laboratories and Duarte
9 Farming, from Modesto, California.
10 Duarte Nursery is our main company. It produces
11 grape vines and apple trees and almond trees for growers
12 throughout California. We're probably the largest
13 permanent crop nursery in the nation.
14 I go out and talk to growers. We've got
15 ambition of one day developing genetically modified
16 apples, genetically modified almonds, and genetically
17 modified grapes to answer the needs of many of our growers
18 we work with. And it's going to be a long process. If
19 it's difficult to deliver these technologies in field
20 crops, and allocate resources towards crops that have
21 millions, or hundreds of millions of acres that can be
22 sold genetically modified technology to, you can imagine
23 the difficulty in finding the investment capital or
24 wherewithal to deliver these crops, these technologies,
25 into the crops we deal with, so that the farmers who grow

1 apples, who just lost two of their major crops protection
2 tools, VIA, the FQPA regulations this last year, who are
3 now wondering how they are going to keep the coddling moth
4 out of their apples. In the future, I'm sure grape
5 growers will be wondering how they're going to keep
6 insects out of their grapes, the leaf rollers, the lead
7 folders, and other insects and disease problems they face.
8 This can answered well through biotechnology. But it's
9 only through a stable, predictable, and effective
10 regulatory framework that these crops will ever attract
11 the capital that will help deliver these technologies into
12 those crops, the crops that I work with, the crops that
13 the growers tell me: That would be great. Can you do it?
14 When can I have it? Because they know what's coming down
15 the pike in terms of pesticides and fungicides in their
16 crop production programs, and it doesn't look good without
17 these technologies.
18 So, I'll ask you, as you answer the needs of
19 those who need more information, of those who want a more
20 open process, do it; but please keep that predicability
21 there that's going to let me attract the capital to a
22 10-year development program.
23 MR. LAKE: Thank you, sir.
24 [Applause.]
25 MR. LAKE: This is the last of our scheduled

1 speakers.

2 CLOSING REMARKS

3 COMMISSIONER HOLSTON: Well, we've come to the
4 end of a very long day, but I have to say, for myself, and
5 I'm certain for my colleagues here on the panel, it has
6 been a very productive and a very informative day. We've
7 heard a wide spectrum of opinions, perspectives,
8 viewpoints on this issue. I think, for every point that
9 was raised on one hand, someone has given the opposite
10 perspective on that same point. Probably the only thing
11 we heard, with any consistency, is that consumers need
12 education. We need to do some a better job of informing
13 people about what this technology is and what is going on.
14 I want to thank all of you for taking the time
15 to be with us. We want you to remember that we do have a
16 written, an open, docket, and that you have until January
17 13 to submit comments to that docket. We also urge you to
18 continue to watch the FDA home page on the internet for
19 further information about this subject and all the
20 developments that we anticipate in the future.
21 Again, thank you very much for your attention
22 and good night.
23 [Applause.]
24 (Whereupon, at 5:55 p.m., the meeting was
25 concluded.)

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 I hereby certify that this is the transcript of the

4 proceedings held before the

5

6 **FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION**

7 on Monday, December 13, 1999,

8

9 and that this is a full and correct transcription of the

10 proceedings.

11

12

13

14 James W. Higgins, CVR

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25