



## POLICY & ACTION FROM CONSUMER REPORTS

Testimony on H 7274, Genetically Engineered Raw and Packaged Food Labeling Act  
before the Rhode Island House Health, Education & Welfare Committee  
Providence, RI

By  
Michael Hansen, Ph.D.  
Senior Scientist, Consumers Union  
February 9, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on H 7274, a bill that would require the labeling of food and food products derived from genetically engineered (GE) organisms. My name is Michael Hansen and I am a senior scientist at Consumers Union<sup>1</sup> (CU), the policy and advocacy arm of *Consumer Reports*, whose headquarters is located in Yonkers. I have worked on the issue of genetically engineered foods for more than 25 years and have been involved in the decisions/debate about these foods at the state, national and international levels. *Consumer Reports* has long supported labeling of GE foods.<sup>2</sup> We strongly support HB 7274.

### **GE Food is Different**

The primary reason GE food should be labeled is that genetically engineered food is fundamentally different. Industry and their allies argue that GE is just an extension of traditional breeding, which humans have been doing for thousands of years. However, GE represents an advance of monumental proportions beyond traditional breeding—the ability to move genetic material *from* any organism *to* any other organism as well as the ability to create genetic material that has never existed before. Last November, FDA approved a genetically engineered salmon that grows to maturity twice as fast as wild salmon due to insertion of genes from two other kinds of fish.<sup>3</sup> Traditional breeding involves transfers of genetic material between closely related organisms. In contrast, GE has been used to move arctic flounder genes into tomatoes, human genes into rice, and spider silk genes into goats. Indeed, many of the GE plants that have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Consumers Union is the public policy and advocacy division of Consumer Reports. Consumers Union works for telecommunications reform, health reform, food and product safety, financial reform, and other consumer issues. Consumer Reports, a non-profit, is the world's largest independent product-testing organization. Using its more than 50 labs, auto test center, and survey research center, the nonprofit rates thousands of products and services annually. Founded in 1936, Consumer Reports has over 8 million subscribers to its magazine, website, and other publications.

<sup>2</sup> Consumer Reports. 2015. GMO Foods: What you need to know. March, 2015. At: <http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/magazine/2015/02/gmo-foods-what-you-need-to-know/index.htm>

<sup>3</sup> FDA. 2015. AquAdvantage Salmon. November 15, 2015. At: <http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/GeneticEngineering/GeneticallyEngineeredAnimals/ucm280853.htm>

commercialized have genetic material for viruses and bacteria inserted into them, including genes for antibiotic resistance; such traits could not be transferred via traditional breeding. GE techniques, which were first discovered only a few decades ago, have been used in agriculture primarily to create commodity crops, including soy, field corn, canola, sugar beets and cotton,<sup>4</sup> that can withstand herbicides, produce their own insecticides, or do both.<sup>5</sup>

### **GE Foods Raise Unique Allergy Concerns**

An important reason to require labeling is that genetic engineering could result in new food allergy responses. A significant number of people have life-threatening allergies to particular foods, such as peanuts and shellfish. They manage their condition by systematically avoiding the foods that trigger a reaction. Through genetic engineering, however, genes that could provoke an allergenic response could be unintentionally introduced into another food, without that fact being apparent. Only through labeling could an allergic consumer distinguish an engineered food which might be causing an allergic reaction, from a non-engineered food, and avoid the reaction-causing food.

In addition to adding an allergenic substance via GE, the process of GE could also increase the existing allergenicity of a food. The process of GE involves randomly inserting new genetic material into the genome of the new organism. One study found that the process of GE turned on a known corn allergen gene in a GE corn that was not turned on in the non-engineered corn.<sup>6</sup> A study submitted to FDA in support of the recently approved GE salmon found that this salmon, genetically engineered to grow to market size faster, had a statistically significant higher allergenic potency compared to the non-engineered salmon, i.e. blood from people allergic to salmon reacted more strongly to the engineered salmon compared to the non-engineered counterpart.<sup>7</sup> The GE salmon were approved by FDA last November, and labeling was not required.<sup>8</sup> Another study found a soybean engineered with a gene from Brazil nuts, caused an allergic reaction in those with Brazil nut allergy; the Brazil nut gene product had not previously been identified as an allergen.<sup>9</sup> Thus, to protect people with food allergies, all GE food should be labeled, so that allergy sufferers can be aware of any new reaction they might have to such a food and have the ability to avoid it.

---

<sup>4</sup> Non-GMO Project, "What is GMO?" available at: <http://www.nongmoproject.org/learn-more/what-is-gmo/>,

<sup>5</sup> USDA-ERS. Adoption of Genetically Engineered Crops in the U.S. At: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/adoption-of-genetically-engineered-crops-in-the-us.aspx>

<sup>6</sup> Zolla, L., Rinalducci, S., Antonioli, P and P.G. Righetti. 2008. Proteomics as a complementary tool for identifying unintended side effects occurring in transgenic maize seeds as a result of genetic modifications. *Journal of Proteome Research*, 7: 1850-1861. At: <http://stopogm.net/sites/stopogm.net/files/webfm/plataforma/proteomicscomplementarytoolzolla.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Hansen, M. 2010. Comments of Consumers Union on safety assessment of AquAdvantage salmon, before Veterinary Medicine Advisory Committee, September 20, 2010. At: <http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/CU-comments-GE-salmon-0910.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> FDA. 2015. Op cit.

<sup>9</sup> Nordlee JA, Taylor SL, Townsend JA, Thomas LA and RK Bush. 1996. Identification of a Brazil-nut allergen in transgenic soybeans. *New England Journal Medicine* 334(11): 688-692. At: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJM199603143341103>

## Safety Assessment Is Not Required

Safety is not the primary reason for labeling genetically engineered food, but given current gaps in safety assessment, safety is not adequately assured and labeling could help identify any safety problems that might possibly arise. There is global agreement that safety assessments should be required for all GE foods prior to marketing. Codex Alimentarius, the food safety standards organization jointly run by the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization (both UN bodies), has developed a set of documents on how GE safety should be assessed<sup>7</sup> including whether there are increased levels of toxins or allergens in the foods, nutritional changes, or if there are any unexpected effects.<sup>10</sup> Premarket safety assessments are now mandatory in most developed countries, including all of Europe, Australia, Japan and China. However, they are not required in the United States.

The US Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) original policy on GE (or GM, for genetically modified) plants, developed in 1992,<sup>11</sup> requires no safety assessments; although companies may go through a "voluntary safety consultation." To date, there have been some 107 "voluntary safety consultations." However, after a consultation, the FDA makes no conclusions about the safety of the GE food, but says it is up to the companies to determine safety of any GE food.

The inadequacy of FDA's policy can be seen in the letter FDA sends to the company after completion of a "safety consultation." For example, the letter sent to Monsanto on September 25, 1996 about one of their first Bt-corn varieties, MON810, states, "Based on the safety and nutritional assessment you have conducted, **it is our understanding that Monsanto has concluded that corn grain and forage derived from the new variety are not materially different in composition, safety, or other relevant parameters from corn grain and forage currently on the market, and that they do not raise issues that would require premarket review or approval by FDA**" (bold added).<sup>12</sup> The letters for all 107 "safety consultations" contain basically the same language. This clearly shows that the FDA has not made a conclusion about the safety for GE plants or the safety of the technology as a whole.

In addition, FDA also does no monitoring of imported food for GE status, and does not require any studies of long term effects. Indeed, FDA has no idea if GE foods are being imported from foreign countries.

One big problem with safety assessments of GE plants is that there have been very few independent long-term animal feeding studies, with most feeding studies being of 90 days or shorter. An analysis of 19 published 90-day or longer studies involving rats or mice fed GE corn or soy found damage in the kidney, liver and bone marrow, which could be potential indicators

---

<sup>10</sup> CAC/GL 44, 2003; CAC/GL 45, 2003; CAC/GL 46, 2003; and CAC/GL 68, 2008 At: [http://www.codexalimentarius.org/standards/list-standards/en/?no\\_cache=1](http://www.codexalimentarius.org/standards/list-standards/en/?no_cache=1)

<sup>11</sup> Pg. 22991 in FDA. Statement of Policy: Foods Derived From New Plant Varieties, May 29, 1992, *Federal Register* vol. 57, No. 104. At: <http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/Biotechnology/ucm096095.htm>

<sup>12</sup> At: <http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodScienceResearch/GEPlants/Submissions/ucm161107.htm>

for the onset of chronic diseases.<sup>13</sup> However, no animal tests are obligatory for any of the GE plants cultivated on a large scale in the US.

A review article of animal feeding studies stated “it is worth mentioning that most of the studies demonstrating that GM foods are as nutritional and safe as those obtained by conventional breeding, have been performed by biotechnology companies or associates”.<sup>14</sup> A review of 94 health risk or nutritional assessment studies of GE foods found “a strong association was found between author affiliation to industry (professional conflict of interest) and study outcome”<sup>15</sup> in terms of health risk or nutritional assessment. Thus, there is a lot of industry bias in much of the feeding and nutritional studies involving GE foods. More independent testing is clearly needed.

In January, a peer-reviewed article, “No scientific consensus on GMO safety,” was published in *Environmental Sciences Europe*.<sup>16</sup> Some 300 scientists have signed on saying they agree that GMOs are not necessarily safe.<sup>17</sup>

In addition, there is virtually no independent safety testing of these crops in the US due to intellectual property right problems. When farmers buy GE seed in the US, they invariably must sign a product stewardship agreement which forbids them from giving such seeds to researchers.<sup>18</sup> In early 2009 26 public sector scientists in the US took the unprecedented step of writing to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) protesting that “as a result of restricted access, no truly independent research can be legally conducted on many critical questions regarding the technology.”<sup>19</sup> As a result, the editors of *Scientific American* published a perspective stating that “we also believe food safety and environmental protection depend on making plant products available to regular scientific scrutiny. Agricultural technology companies should therefore immediately remove the restriction on research from their end-user agreements.” We concur and believe that only truly independent safety tests will give us an answer about the safety of GE foods. In the meantime, it’s crucial that GE foods be labeled, so that if people experience negative effects, they and their doctors can identify them.

But even if all reasonable safety testing were required, certain individuals could still have unusual allergic responses that would not be detected beforehand. Finally, there can be

<sup>13</sup> Séralini, G-E, Mesnage, R., Clair, E., Gress, S., de Vendômois, JS and D. Cellier. 2011. Genetically modified crops safety assessments: present limits and possible improvements. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 23: 10. At: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186%2F2190-4715-23-10>

<sup>14</sup> Pg. 741 in Domingo JL and JG Bordonaba. 2011. A literature review on the safety assessment of genetically modified plants. *Environment International* 37: 734-742. At: <http://maurin.bnk.free.fr/Domingo%20et%20al.,%202011.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> Diels J, Cunha M, Manaia C, Sabugosa-Madeira B and M Silva. 2011. Association of financial or professional conflict of interest to research outcomes on health risks or nutritional assessment studies of genetically modified products. *Food Policy*, 36(2): 197-203. At: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919210001302>

<sup>16</sup> Hilbeck et al. 2015. No scientific consensus on GMO safety. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 27: 4. At: <http://www.enveurope.com/content/pdf/s12302-014-0034-1.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> ENSEER. 2015. Signatories to No Scientific Consensus on GMO Safety. At [http://www.ensser.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/150120\\_signatories\\_no\\_consensus\\_lv.pdf](http://www.ensser.org/fileadmin/user_upload/150120_signatories_no_consensus_lv.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Waltz, E. 2009. Under wraps. *Nature Biotechnology*, 27(10): 880-882. At: [http://www.emilywaltz.com/Biotech\\_crop\\_research\\_restrictions\\_Oct\\_2009.pdf](http://www.emilywaltz.com/Biotech_crop_research_restrictions_Oct_2009.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=do-seed-companies-control-gm-crop-research>

unexpected effects--just as there are sometimes to pharmaceutical products, despite extensive premarket testing. For these reasons, it is important to label genetically engineered food, so negative effects can be noticed and identified, to help with any future epidemiological studies to track potential health impacts of consuming GE foods, and so consumers who simply want to avoid these new foods can do so if they wish.

## GE and Herbicide Use

One other key public health issue is the use of glyphosate, a weed killer, on GE crops. Last year, 17 experts from 11 countries met at the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and unanimously agreed to re-classify glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans" (e.g. Group 2A).<sup>20, 21</sup> Of the 17 experts involved in this decision, two were from the US EPA, one from the US National Institute of the Environmental Health Sciences, and one was from California EPA. The Chair of the Committee was Dr. Aaron Blair, who, prior to retiring, led the occupational cancer unit at the National Cancer Institute for 30 years.<sup>22</sup> Last September, California's Environmental Protection Agency announced plans to list glyphosate as a carcinogen, as part of Proposition 65.<sup>23</sup>

This finding, that glyphosate is probably carcinogenic in humans, is important since virtually all GE food crops have been engineered to withstand the weed killer glyphosate. As a result, as acreage in GE crops has expanded, so has glyphosate use. In the period between 1996 and 2011, during which GE crops were introduced into U.S. agriculture, herbicide use was greatly increased.<sup>24</sup> In 1995 some 20 million pounds of glyphosate were used in US agriculture; by 2012 that figure had increased, more than ten times over, to an estimated 280 million pounds.<sup>25</sup> This drastic increase in glyphosate use has almost certainly increased the residues on food. Although the USDA's Pesticide Data Program doesn't collect data on glyphosate residues in foods, in 2011, USDA did test 300 soybean samples and found glyphosate residues in 271 samples.<sup>26</sup> Another study, published in the journal *Food Chemistry*, found glyphosate residues in all the samples of soy they tested, which were

---

<sup>20</sup> Guyton KZ, Loomis D, Grosse Y et al. 2015. Carcinogenicity of tetrachlorvinphos, parathion, malathion, diazinon, and glyphosate. *Lancet Oncology*, At: <http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045%2815%2970134-8/abstract>

<sup>21</sup> This classification was based on limited evidence from case control epidemiology studies (which found a link with non-Hodgkin lymphoma in studies from US, Canada, and Sweden) and sufficient evidence from animal studies (2 studies in mice, 2 studies in rats). In addition, there was strong evidence for mechanism of action (or how glyphosate may lead to cancer), e.g. genotoxicity and oxidative stress.

<sup>22</sup> Guyton KZ, Loomis D, Grosse Y et al. 2015. Op cit.

<sup>23</sup> Chow, L. 2015. California Becomes First State to Label Monsanto's Roundup as a Carcinogen. *EcoWatch* At: <http://ecowatch.com/2015/09/08/california-becomes-first-state-to-label-monsantos-roundup-as-a-carcinogen/>

<sup>24</sup> Benbrook, CM. 2012. Impacts of genetically engineered crops on pesticide use in the U.S.—the first 16 years. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 24:24. At: <http://www.enveurope.com/content/pdf/2190-4715-24-24.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> US Geologic Service. Pesticide National Synthesis Project. At: [http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/pnsp/usage/maps/show\\_map.php?year=2005&map=GLYPHOSATE&hilo=L](http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/pnsp/usage/maps/show_map.php?year=2005&map=GLYPHOSATE&hilo=L)

<sup>26</sup> Gillam, C. 2015. Regulators may recommend testing food for glyphosate. Reuters. April 20. At: <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-food-agriculture-glyphosate-idUSKBN0NB1N020150420>

from ten different farms growing GE soy in Iowa.<sup>27</sup> Labelling of GE foods would allow consumers concerned about potential residues to minimize their glyphosate exposure.

### **Costs of Labeling Will Be Minimal**

An analysis of existing studies of the cost of labeling commissioned by Consumers Union and conducted by the independent economic research firm ECONorthwest found that the median cost that might be passed on to consumers was just \$2.30 per person annually, less than a penny a day.<sup>28</sup> Campbell Soup announced last month that they both plan to label the food products they sell for presence of GE ingredients and to support federal mandatory labeling of GE foods.<sup>29</sup> Campbell Soup also stated that they felt the costs of such mandatory federal labeling would be minimal and that they did not plan to raise their prices of their products.

Opponents of labeling cite industry-funded studies to suggest that mandatory GE food labeling would cause food prices to soar, boosting a typical family of four's spending by \$400 to \$800 or more, on average, per year. Such studies, such as the one released last year by a Cornell University professor, which came up with a figure of \$500 per family per year, make a number of unreasonable assumptions to come up with the supposedly large cost of labeling GE foods.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, the Washington Post Fact Checker feature just gave this Cornell study a rating of three Pinocchios (significant factual error and/or obvious contradiction) out of a possible four.<sup>31</sup>

### **Voluntary Labeling is Not Sufficient**

Consumers can currently avoid genetically engineered foods by buying food labeled as USDA Organic, which does not allow use of GMOs, or foods labeled Non-GMO Project Verified, which are certified to have no more than 0.9% engineered content. However these labels are not sufficient to meet consumer needs. Organic foods are only about 5 percent of the total market, and because they are grown according to rules that also prohibit pesticides and antibiotics and have other requirements, are often more expensive. The Non-GMO Project label is growing rapidly, but is also a small percent of the market and has very limited availability. Testing by *Consumer Reports* found GE ingredients in many packaged foods, including breakfast cereals, chips, baking mixes, protein bars and soy infant formula which were not labeled.<sup>32</sup> Voluntary labeling but puts burden of labeling in wrong place. Consumers want to know about all the food they are buying, not just a small percentage.

<sup>27</sup> Bøhn T, Cuhra M, Traavik T, Sanden M, Fagan J and R Primicerio. Compositional differences in soybeans on the market: glyphosate accumulates in Roundup Ready GM soybeans. *Food Chemistry* 153: 207-215. At: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308814613019201>

<sup>28</sup> Dyke A and R Whelan. 2014. GE Foods Labeling Cost Study Findings. 14 pp. At:

[http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/GMO\\_labeling\\_cost\\_findings\\_Exe\\_Summ.pdf](http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/GMO_labeling_cost_findings_Exe_Summ.pdf)

<sup>29</sup> Strom, S. 2016. Campbell Labels Will Disclose G.M.O. Ingredients. *New York Times*, January 8, 2016, available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/08/business/campbell-labels-will-disclose-gmo-ingredients.html>

<sup>30</sup> Hansen, M. 2014. Industry funded GMO labeling study relies on faulty assumptions for cost estimates. At: [http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Industry\\_Funded\\_GMO\\_Labeling\\_Study\\_Rebutal.pdf](http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Industry_Funded_GMO_Labeling_Study_Rebutal.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> Lee, MYH. 2015. Would GMO labeling requirement cost \$500 more in groceries per family a year? April 6. At: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/wp/2015/04/06/would-gmo-labeling-requirement-cost-500-more-in-groceries-per-family-a-year/>

<sup>32</sup> Consumer Reports. 2014. Where GMOs hide in food. At: <http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/2014/10/where-gmos-hide-in-your-food/index.htm>

## Consumers Want Labels/Several States and Many Countries Require Them

A 2014 nationally representative poll by Consumers Union found that 92% of consumers would like genetically engineered food to be labeled.<sup>33</sup> A *New York Times* poll last year got an almost identical result, 93% in favor.<sup>34</sup> This is starting to be translated into law in the United States. In 2014 Vermont became the first state to require mandatory labeling, a requirement that will go into effect in July of this year.<sup>35</sup> Maine<sup>36</sup> and Connecticut<sup>37</sup> passed laws that will go into effect when a total of five northeast states have similar requirements. Alaska has a law on the books to require labeling of GE fish. Finally, 64 countries, which together include more than half the world's population, (including all European Union, China, India, Japan, Korea, Australia, Russia, Brazil and South Africa), require labeling of GE foods.<sup>38</sup>

## GE Labeling Bill Likely to Survive Legal Challenge

If Rhode Island is concerned about whether their GE labeling bill would hold up in court, the decision of the US District Court for the District of Vermont, announced in April, 2015 should be very reassuring. The Court turned down the request of the Grocery Manufacturers Association and their allies for an injunction against Vermont's mandatory GE labeling law, ruling against three often cited objections to labeling.<sup>39</sup> The Court decided that labels such as "produced with genetic engineering," or "partially produced with genetic engineering" do not violate the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, are not preempted by federal law, and do not violate the First Amendment rights of the companies producing GE foods. The court also dismissed the idea that the GE labeling bill is only based on a desire to gratify consumer curiosity. Indeed, the court stated that the "(T)he safety of food products, the protection of the environment, and the accommodation of religious belief and practices are all quintessential government interests, as is the State's desire 'to promote informed consumer decision-making.'"<sup>40</sup> As for the argument that GE labels are "political speech," or that they are "controversial," the Court disagreed and noted that the GE disclosure requirement

<sup>33</sup> Consumer Reports National Research Center. 2014. Consumer Support for Standardization and Labeling of Genetically Engineered Food: 2014 Nationally-Representative Phone Survey. available at:

[http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/2014\\_GMO\\_survey\\_report.pdf](http://consumersunion.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/2014_GMO_survey_report.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> Kopicki, A. 2013. Strong Support for Labeling Modified Foods. *New York Times*, July 27, 2013, available at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/28/science/strong-support-for-labeling-modified-foods.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/28/science/strong-support-for-labeling-modified-foods.html?_r=0)

<sup>35</sup> Act. No. 120 (H.112), "An act relating to the labeling of food produced with genetic engineering," available at: <http://openstates.org/vt/bills/2013-2014/H112/>

<sup>36</sup> "An Act to Protect Maine Food Consumers' Right to Know about Genetically Engineered Food and Seed Stock," available at [http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/bills\\_126th/billtexts/HP049001.asp](http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/bills_126th/billtexts/HP049001.asp)

<sup>37</sup> Substitute House Bill No. 6527, Public Act No. 13-183, "An Act Concerning Genetically Engineered Food," available at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2013/ACT/pa/pdf/2013PA-00183-R00HB-06527-PA.pdf>

<sup>38</sup> Center for Food Safety, "International Labeling Laws," available at:

<http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/976/ge-food-labeling/international-labeling-laws>

<sup>39</sup> Grocery Manufacturers Association et al. v William Sorrell, Peter Shumlin, Tracy Dolan and James Reardon. 2015. Case No. 5:14-cv-117. OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS AND DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. At: [http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/vermont-decision\\_81793.pdf](http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/vermont-decision_81793.pdf)

<sup>40</sup> Pp. 63-64 in IBID.

“remains a factual disclosure regarding a food product’s ingredients made in conjunction with the purchase and sale of food.”<sup>41</sup>

Because of the safety questions raised by the long-term feeding studies and the new toxicity information on glyphosate, the allergy issues, the lack of consensus on GE food safety, and because consumers have a basic right to know that they are eating, CU supports labeling of GE food. Such labeling is important because consumers have a right to choose the foods they eat and to avoid any unintended health effects. We also believe that labeled foods will not be more expensive to consumers, and that H 7274 would likely survive any legal challenges.

Bottom line, CU strongly supports mandatory labeling of GE foods and so supports H 7274.

---

<sup>41</sup> Pg. 54 in IBID.



