

Parallel report to the 4th and 5th state report of Canada on the implementation of the International Pact on economic, social and cultural rights

Social Human Rights in Canada

Violations of Human Rights in Agriculture and of Consumers

Presented by: Organic Agriculture Protection Fund (OAPF)
& Percy Schmeiser, Canadian farmer

Contact: OAPF Chair: Arnold Taylor,
President of Saskatchewan Organic Directorate
Box 130, Canwood, SK SOJ OKO, Canada
Phone: 001 / 306 – 468 2218 Fax: 001 / 306 – 648 - 2346

Percy Schmeiser,
Bruno, Saskatchewan, Box 400 SOK OSO, Canada
Tel.: 001 / 306 369 2520, Fax: 001 / 306 369 2304

March 14, 2006

The information given in this report focuses on the consequences of a highly perturbing global development which seriously violates the economic, social and cultural rights of farmers and consumers by the implementation of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in the area of food production and agriculture.

Canada in particular is heavily affected by this development. It is the world's fourth-largest producer of genetically modified agricultural products. Because of the large-scale cultivation of GM rape and the proceeding contamination, genetically-manipulated plants are already growing on more than 50% of the agricultural acreage of Canada. The spread of GM rape has got out of control since 1999.

80 % of the consumers are, according to polls, against the use of genetic engineering in food and agriculture. In Switzerland, there has even been a national referendum – and the people have clearly rejected the introduction of genetic engineering.

This shows that most of farmers and consumers do not want to fool around with a risky technology with already proven consequences. And – there is no way back: Once contaminated – always contaminated and contaminating more and more.

So it comes to a struggle- a struggle between a few corporations and most of the farmers and consumers, against the people. It is about world-wide control over agricultural production and our nutrition, about world domination.

In Canada, the GMO corporations have already nearly succeeded. Consumers feel powerless and neglected by their government. But more and more farmers are filing complaints against the corporations. Because the power and lobbying of big agribusiness and the completely GMO-contamination of Canada results in a loss of quality of life and livelihood for farmers and consumers: Farmers became dependent on agro-business and their economic survival is in danger – with the implementation of GM-plants in Canada they lost their chance to choose, they lost any self-determination. Their land became contaminated – if they wanted or not – with all negative consequences – destroyed harvest, destroyed existence,

In some countries this fact is now leading to suicides of many thousands of farmers, because they see no way out of their debts, and is a result of this development.

Consumers are forced to buy GM products and lose the chance to freely choose their food, which is known to result in health problems – sometimes even fatal - as proven in many studies and first experiences worldwide. In Canada too, there has already been a dramatic rise in illnesses since the introduction of GMOs (www.oekosmos.de, 19.6.2004).

The rights of the people to self determination, the right to food, the right to health and to independent research about the risks of this new technology are already being massively infringed in Canada.

That's why we are urging the government of Canada

- to forbid GMOs in the area of food production and agriculture in Canada by law
- to realize the obligation to clearly mark GM products in food for humans and feed stuff for animals
- to introduce a legal liability for agribusiness to be responsible for all consequences of GMO for the health of mankind and nature and the danger of irreversibly contaminating the soil leading to the destruction of the basis of farmers' livelihoods, esp. organic farmers
- compensation for the economic losses of farmers who have been producing GMO-free until now. Their losses are estimated at over \$14 million in Saskatchewan alone.

We are requesting the committee on economic, social and cultural rights to present its concerns about the use of GMOs in Canada and to formulate recommendations to the Government of Canada on how to handle this problem of GMO, which is essential for life.

Arnold Taylor
Chair of OAPF Committee
President of Saskatchewan Organic Directorate

Percy Schmeiser
Canadian farmer

List of contents

1. Introduction
2. Violations of the rights of people to self-determination (Art. 1)
3. Violation of the Right to Work (Art. 6)
4. Violation of the Right to an appropriate living standard, protection against hunger – Right to Food (Art. 11)
5. Violation of the Right to Health of the Body and Soul (Art. 12)
6. Violations of the Right to Freedom in Sciences & Research (Art. 15)
7. Steps in order to ensure the rights of farmers and consumers

1.) Introduction

Canada, with a surface area of about 10 million km², is the second-largest country on Earth, and has about 32 million inhabitants. The agriculture and food sector is the third-largest employment sector in Canada. The agricultural market contributes about 10 % to the financing of the Canadian budget. Each of the 280,000 farms feeds 120 people. More than 50 % of agricultural products are exported, especially cereals and oil seeds. Canada has a share of about 20 % of the international wheat trade. Canada is the fifth-largest producer of cereals in the world – 82 % of its wheat harvest is exported!
(www.lastminute-reisegeier.de/Reiseinfo/Kanada.cfm)

Canada is the world's fourth-largest producer of genetically modified agricultural products. Genetically manipulated plants are already being cultivated on more than 90 m ha world-wide, and Canada holds a share of 6.4 %; that is 5,8 m ha of the total Canadian agricultural acreage of 70m ha (www.isaaa.org).

Since the middle of the nineties, GM rape has been planted from many farmers. Since 1999 it has become clear that the spread of genetically modified rape has got out of control – because after only 5 years, genetically modified plants have grown on over 50% of the fields of Canada. Today, there is nearly no GM-free rape in Canada (SZ, 21.6.2004 “Canada's farmers suffer from GE-cultivation”, *presstext Austria* “Canadian farmers take legal action against seed producers” 17.8.2002). With his situation serious problems have affected all the farmers, the most problems got the farmers decided to plant GM-free. From this many farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy, as many of the countries of destination of their exports now don't buy rape from Canada any more. “We will never again be able to cultivate GM-free rape”, says Larry Hoffman, an affected organic farmer (www.Saskorganic.com – “Out of control – we accuse!”).

The GM corporation Monsanto (with 91 % share of the world market “ruler” of the GM food-market – l. “Trojan seeds”, J. M. Smith p. 15) is now also trying to introduce genetically modified wheat onto the market, which has been prevented up to now by the resistance of many farmers and consumers. This would be the end for Canada's GM-free producing farmers, whose emphasis is on the world-wide export of (GM-free) wheat.

In Canada, no additional safety tests are prescribed for the licensing of genetically modified food, and labelling does not exist either. Nearly all transgenic plants are admitted in USA, where security tests are based on information of the GM-industry. What means, that there are no safety tests about any risks published. Therefore farmers as well as bee-keepers and consumers have lost their option to choose, their right to self-determination, their right to health, their right to unhindered access to food without unhealthy substances.

Numerous independent studies and experiences worldwide – and also already in Canada - show the risks and consequences of GMOs for food, the irreversible consequences of using GMOs for the health of humans and nature in the case of the contamination of traditional plants, and the destruction of the natural basis of life for future generations and their food.

Who needs GMOs and whom do they serve?

The answer is clear for Alfred Haiger, a well-known Austrian scientist in the area of agriculture:

“GM is only of advantage to less than 10 agro-industrial companies and some industry-dependent scientists, for nobody else” as he writes in the introduction to the recent book „*Danger Genetic Engineering*“, p. 16. This agribusiness acts worldwide and is supported by the US government; they think in terms of profit ignoring health and welfare of humans. “Ruling food means ruling mankind” was a saying of Henry Kissinger's. Thus, Governments

no longer fulfil the needs of their people, but follow the path of profit of some big agribusiness corporations in their attempt to govern globalisation.

This tendency results in an increasing danger for human rights in the areas of food, health, freedom in sciences and research globally and also in Canada leading to the destruction of farmer's livelihoods.

“Because of the threatening and substantial risks caused by the plants of the defendants (GM corporations), they should immediately be withdrawn from service.” (*Dr. Mae Wan Ho, Director and Cofounder of the Institute of Science in Society, London, UK in www.saskorganic.com, Press release from December 20, 2002*).

We sincerely hope, that the committee for economic, social and cultural rights is able and willing to help out in order to support people's rights, which are written down in the International Pact.

Now we wish to let a Canadian farmers' organisation speak directly, giving a short summary of the situation in Canada:

Ten Reasons Why We Don't Want GM Wheat

Wheat is one of humanity's most important and culturally-significant sources of food. Monsanto plans to introduce genetically-modified (GM) wheat. Monsanto has inserted a GE so that the wheat crop can be sprayed with Monsanto's weed spray Roundup: killing other plants but not the wheat. There are many reasons that Canadians—consumers and farmers alike—don't want GM wheat, here are ten.

1. Market loss

The international customers that buy 82% of Canada's **wheat** crop say that they will stop buying if Canada introduces **GM wheat**. They are clear: they will stop buying *all wheat* from us: **GM** and non-**GM** alike. One customer, Warburtons (a large British bakery), received 6,000 customer inquiries in 2001 regarding food safety and **GM wheat**. **GM wheat kills markets.**

2. The end of organic agriculture

GM wheat threatens to destroy organic agriculture in much of Canada. **GM** canola has made it nearly impossible for organic farmers to grow that crop: seed supply contamination and pollen drift mean that organic farmers cannot be sure that their canola will be free of **GM** seeds. The introduction of **GM wheat** and subsequent **GM** crops will leave organic farmers fewer and fewer crops to grow. Organic crop production will become nearly impossible and Canadians will lose access to locally-grown, organic food. **GM wheat yes = organic no!**

3. Lower prices for farmers

GM wheat will dramatically decrease demand for Canadian **wheat**. Lower prices to farmers are easy to predict. On the other hand, producing **GM-free** Canadian **wheat** will give our farmers a marketing advantage if the U.S. and other nations introduce **GM wheat**. High-quality, **GM-free** Canadian **wheat** could be our competitive advantage, our premium product. **Stopping GM wheat means higher prices for farmers.**

4. Health concerns

Many Canadians, like citizens around the world, question the safety of **GM** foods. Further, Canadians have grave doubts about Canada's food safety regulatory system—a system based, not on independent testing in government labs, but on reviewing data from Monsanto and similar companies. Finally, farmers and consumers cannot trust the government to regulate because it is too busy promoting the **GM** food industry. **Why take a risk on GM foods?**

5. Environmental damage

GM wheat, once released, cannot be hauled back in. Once this life form is in the environment, it is there forever. Not only can **we** not recall **GM wheat**, **we** cannot contain or control it. **GM** canola is now cross-pollinating with non-**GM** canola and with related wild species. Monsanto's **wheat** genes will similarly "flow" through the environment. Again, Canadians know that there has not been sufficient, independent testing done on the long-term ecosystem effects of genetically-modifying the planet's food crops. **This is a completely unnecessary threat to the environment.**

6. Agronomic costs

Some farmers now grow **GM Roundup Ready** canola. Spray that canola with Roundup, and the weeds die and the canola is unscathed. But introduce **GM Roundup Ready wheat** and the equation changes. Farmers will need additional chemicals to control volunteer Roundup Ready **wheat** in their RR canola and to control volunteer RR canola in their RR **wheat**. One agronomist estimated the additional weed control costs at up to **\$400 million annually**.

7. Segregation won't work

Monsanto says that segregation systems are the solution to market rejection: keep **GM** and non-**GM wheat** separate from field to customer. But segregation systems will fail because **GM** varieties will soon contaminate our **wheat** seed supply. Tests on canola show that most 'non-**GM**' certified seed contains **GM** varieties. The same will happen to **wheat**. With contaminated seed, it's impossible to run a segregation system. Further, our bulk, high-throughput grain handling system is ill-designed to segregate: with thousands of points where grain could be mis-represented, mixed, or mis-labelled. Just one or two mistakes, just one or two customers demanding non-**GM wheat** and getting **GM**, could cost Canada its reputation for grain quality and cost farmers hundreds-of-millions of dollars annually. And even without mistakes, many customers say that if Canada introduces **GM** varieties, they will stop buying Canadian **wheat** altogether, regardless of whether we try to segregate. Ironically, the way that segregation will work in practice is that international **wheat customers** will segregate the world's **wheat** exporters into those who plant **GM** varieties and those who **don't** and buy from those who **don't**. Finally, successful or not, segregation systems will cost farmers millions. **Segregation is costly and will fail.**

8. Labelling

Most Canadians **want GM** food ingredients labelled. But governments, processors and retailers, and corporations such as Monsanto oppose labelling. They oppose your right to know if you are eating **GM** food. These companies claim that the fate of **GM** foods should be left to "the market", and then simultaneously deny us the information with which we could make an informed decision at the grocery store. It is totally illegitimate, until we have mandatory labelling and an informed public, to introduce new **GM** foods. **What are they afraid of?**

9. Corporate control

Transnationals such as Monsanto, Cargill, and ConAgra are increasing their control over our food supply. Worse, Monsanto and others are taking control, not only of our seeds, but of the genes—the building blocks of life. And they use patents and courts to enforce that control. The tremendous market power that agri-biz transnationals already have, and their attendant ability to suck the profits out of farmers' pockets, is the real cause of the farm income crisis. **GM wheat** offers no net benefits to farmers or consumers but it dramatically increases corporate control of the global food system.

Should Monsanto control our seeds and our food?

10. We don't need it

Farmers are told, rightly or wrongly, that there is too much grain in the world: **we don't** need **GM wheat** in order to grow more. Consumers will see no benefit from **GM wheat**: with or without it, bread prices will still go up. **GM wheat** brings no benefits. **GM wheat** is not a solution: it creates problems rather than solving them. **Let's say no to this turkey.**

One reason why you would want GM wheat

1. If you're a Monsanto shareholder

Independent economists report that the financial benefits from **GM wheat** will go to Monsanto: farmers' costs will rise and consumers will not see lower bread prices. Monsanto lost \$2.5 billion [Cdn.\$] in 2002, mostly because of lower Roundup sales. Monsanto needs to return to profitability. Thus, it is pushing its **GM Roundup Ready wheat**. With **GM wheat**, the profits go to Monsanto and the risks and costs go to consumers and farmers.

Glossary:

Genetically-modified (GM): Canada's Royal Society defined "genetic modification" as the direct transfer or modification of genetic material using recombinant DNA techniques. "Genetic modification" is the human insertion or manipulation of genes or genetic material, distinct from traditional plant-breeding techniques.

Roundup Ready (RR) wheat: **GM wheat** wherein Monsanto has inserted a GE that allows the plant to tolerate applications of Roundup (Monsanto's trade name for the broad-spectrum herbicide glyphosate).

This information is brought to you by the National Farmers Union

National Office
2717 Wentz Ave.
Saskatoon, Sask., S7K 4B6
Tel (306) 652-9465
Fax (306) 664-6226

Over the past decade, the NFU worked alongside rural and urban allies across Canada and stopped Monsanto from introducing its genetically-modified dairy cow hormone designed to increase milk production, rBGH. Together, we won on milk, and we can win on wheat.

***Farmers, please join with us to protect Canadian family farms and to create better food and agricultural policies for Canada.
To join, please send a cheque for \$150 to the address above.***

Non-farmers, please support our ongoing work to ensure that all Canadians have access to safe, nutritious food. Please become an Associate Member by sending a cheque for \$50 to the address above.

(02/03)

2) Violation of people's right to self-determination acc. to Art. 1

Section 1: "All People have the right to self-determination"

Violation of the Right of the People in Canada

The people's right to self-determination is no longer ensured due to the introduction of GMOs in Canada:

- **A case of contamination: GM-Rape everywhere!**

„What in Europe is still a nightmare of the future, is already reality in Canada: The use of genetically manipulated seeds leads to a complete contamination of the soil.“
(„Saskatchewan dies“, TV documentary by Ute Daniels, Phoenix, Sa. 5.03.05). Since the large-scale cultivation of genetically manipulated rape, no GM-free rape seed can be grown any more in Canada. Rape cross-pollinates over extremely large distances. Investigations have found pollen even at a distance of 26 km. 33 probes of certificated GM-free seeds have been analysed, whereby 32 were contaminated. (*“The case for a GM-free sustainable world”, ISP, paper saving version, www.indsp.org, June 15, 2003, p. 3*)

“The main source of GMO-contamination is the transfer of transgenic pollen through wind. Thus, it can be generally concluded that contamination through GMOs cannot be avoided: coexistence is unreal” (*“The case for a GM-free sustainable world”, ISP, June 15, 2003, p. 3*). Direct seed movement and volunteer canola plants are also important vectors for GM transgene flow throughout the environment.

In view of five million ha of GM-rape, the production of GM-free honey has also become impossible. („Contamination – GM-plants out of control“ – flyer from the Environment Institute Munich). The Canadian government, however, insists on the possibility of a co-existence of conventional and genetically modified useful plants. It claims that the cultivation of GM-plants is safe if the distance to conventionally planted fields is 50 or even 10 meters. „That's a joke. Farmers know that you cannot prevent pollen or seeds from spreading.“ (Percy Schmeiser, farmer from Saskatchewan / Canada, in: *The Ecologist*; May 2004) All safety distances are indeed ridiculous.

In May 2004, Monsanto reacted because of the united resistance of many consumers, farmers and food producers, and has provisionally delayed the large-scale cultivation of GM-manipulated wheat in Canada for an indefinite time.

On the other hand, the field trials with GM-wheat went on – against a self-commitment from Monsanto not to do so. The Canadian food supervision authorities then wrote to Greenpeace stating that 16 field trials with Monsanto-wheat had already been conducted in 2004. Recent studies show that wheat pollen can be carried by the wind for several hundred meters. The Canadian food authority, nevertheless, prescribes for field trials a safety distance to the next wheat field of only 30 meters ... Greenpeace comments: „This incident again shows what one should think of self-commitments by the industry when their profits are at stake. Monsanto has again proven its disdain for the interests of the environment, farmers, and the deceived public“. (*Radio Green Wave 2.9.04 „Field trials with GM-wheat – Monsanto keeps at it”. 20.8.2004*).

„A contamination of GM-free cereals by genetically manipulated wheat could mean the end of organic agriculture ...“ Many Canadian farmers have realized a judicial

confrontation is now becoming necessary, and have issued a law suit of their association against the GMO corporations Monsanto and Aventis. „After politics has abandoned us, we regard the law suit as the only possibility to hold the GM-multinationals liable“, says Marc Loiselle, a farmer (*„Canadian farmers take seed producer to court“ presstext.austria Wien, 13.08.2002*). In this way, the introduction of GM-wheat in Canada shall subsequently be prevented (*www.saskorganic.com*).

„The idea of a so-called „coexistence“ between manipulated und non-manipulated plants is impracticable. Even in countries without the cultivation of GM plants, the contaminations accumulate. GM technology has already got out of control. This process is intended by the GM technology corporations: „ The industry hopes that the market will become so flooded that you cannot do anything against it any more. One just capitulates.“ (*Don Westfall, counsellor of many GM technology corporations in „Contamination – GM plants out of control“ flyer of the Environment Institute München e. V.*)

Excerpt of an interview with Percy Schmeiser (*in: The Ecologist, May 2004*) about the meaningfulness of the field trials:

„ Which goal did they have? “

P.S.: For the biotechnology companies „ this is a good opportunity to get a toe in the door, and then of course the whole foot!“

„Is the real task then to contaminate the neighbouring fields?“

P.S.:” That is the goal! There is no other reason for these trials.“

„Do the biotech-firms really believe that they can collect license fees forever if they contaminate all the fields of the world with their GM-seed?“

P.S.: No, but their objective is their contamination, and recently, Dale Adolphe, the chairman of the Canadian Seed Growers Association, which sells seeds from Monsanto, said: „ There is so much resistance worldwide against any further field trials of GM-technologically modified plants, that contamination is the only possibility to proceed with it.“ Saying something like that is really outrageous. He admitted: „We are doing it in a way that gives people no other option.“

Another example about this practice of the biotech industry:

2005 soya plants have been tested throughout Romania: it was found that 90 % of the plants were genetically manipulated without the authorities being informed and without the knowledge of most of the farmers. Based on the lack of control the biotech industry has created an irreversible situation. Once contaminated – always contaminated!

Due to these practices of the GM industry, farmers and beekeepers have lost their right to self-determination.

- **The loss of consumers’ option to choose:**

80 % of consumers are, according to polls, against the use of GM technology in food and agriculture. In Switzerland, a referendum on the introduction of GM technology has even been conducted – the people clearly rejected the introduction of GM technology.

In Canada, no additional safety tests are demanded for the licensing of genetically modified food, and there is no labelling either. In this way, the consumers have also lost their option to choose, their right to self-determination.

Percy Schmeiser, farmer from Canada:

“We have the right to know what we are eating. If the people in Canada really knew

what they were eating, they would not touch most of the GM food anymore! “ („*Danger Genetic Engineering*“ ed. M. Grössler, p. 197)

A contamination of GM-free grain species by genetically manipulated wheat (e. g. by field trials) would, in addition to that, mean the loss of any source of GM-free food. (www.saskorganic.com „*Food is life – funds for the protection of organic agriculture*).

Conclusion: The only way to ensure the right of self-determination of Canadian people is to fully ban the use of GMOs in food-production and agriculture in Canada.

Section 2: „All people can freely dispose of their natural wealth- in no case may the basis for people’s livelihoods be taken away from them.“

The livelihood of farming is being taken away by „**terminator technology**“ and by the **patenting of plants** together with the **danger of “partial expropriation by force”** from farmers:

- „The development of **terminator technology** is especially scandalous. In more than 87 countries sterile seed has been registered for patenting, this means seeds which can be used just once. Next year new seeds must be bought again from agribusiness. This is big business for industry, as they expect a jump in sales and growth. What is being neglected is that small scale farmers are unable to buy new seeds every year. Thus they become dependent and at the same time they are forced to take on debts without having a guarantee of getting a good yield. This development endangers the livelihoods of millions of – at least small scale – farmers” (“*Patented expropriation*“, Marlies Olberz, *Food First*, p. 13)
- But farmers are also **becoming dependent** on GM-industries **via patents**: Big agribusiness is going to apply for patents of more and more plants, e.g. rice. This means that if farmers cultivate rice in the future, they must buy the seeds from Monsanto year for year (terminator seeds) and must pay royalties for licensing. Farmers in India created 200 sorts of original seeds in order to be independent. However, this would become illegal after patenting, leading to severe punishments.

Percy Schmeiser, Canadian farmer, on the situation in Canada :
“For the privilege of growing GMO plants, you have to pay a \$15 / acre (one acre = ca. 0.4047 ha) annual license fee to Monsanto. These are also the fears of many domestic farmers: To have to give up any self-determination regarding seeds, and to be at the mercy of a multinational corporation which sets the rules according to its own opinion.“ (P. Schmeiser in „*Danger Genetic Engineering*“ v. M. Grössler)
“Using patent rights, agribusiness is taking over the rights of self-determination regarding plants, ignoring the rights of indigenous peoples, as they are not allowed any longer to use their own seeds from their ancestors. This is clearly a case of theft.” („*Patented expropriation*“, Marlies Olberz, *Food First*, S. 13). Free access to seed is essential for 1.3 billion farmers for their survival. Patents clearly represent by definition an exclusive right for use by the patent holder. The rights of all others, contributing to further development -

esp. in the case of animals, plants and general organisms with productive properties being used as a basis of life and food - are totally ignored and neglected and - even worse – their practise illegalised.

Governments have neglected the rights of farmers in the case of seeds and access to genetic resources as well as the right of consumers to appropriate food. This violation is extremely serious as the interests of economic players are favoured and the position of monopolists with regard to food plants and corresponding products are enhanced. It can be expected that situations will occur where violations of the right to food for future generations arise.

Vandana Shiva, the alternative Nobel prize winner from India, known for her engagement against GMOs and for the independence of the Indian population, expresses her opinion clearly: “ This is a case of the enslaving of farmers” (*Biopiraterie mit Reis-Saatgut*”, www.dradio.de, 8.7.04,)

- **Partial expropriation of farmers as a case of violation of basic rights:**

The implementation of GMOs will lead to a partial expropriation of GMO-free farming farmers without them being offered any substitute. They have no possibility to protect their land from contamination through their neighbours – and as a consequence their contaminated crops will not be able to be sold anymore. Again, their livelihoods are being illegally taken away, constituting a violation of human rights as a consequence of the introduction of GMOs.

The case of the Canadian farmer Percy Schmeiser is a very well-known example for precisely this situation of farmers in Canada – showing the violations of this right of Canadian farmers very well: The company Monsanto has sued him for the infraction of the patent rights of the firm. (*aus The Ecologist May 2004 und “The case of Percy Schmeiser against Monsanto” in “Danger Genetic Engineering”, M. Grössler*):

For fourty years, Percy Schmeiser has grown rape on his farm in the Canadian province Saskatchewan. Normally, he has held back each year a part of the oleiferous seeds of his harvest and sown them again next year. In 1998, Monsanto took Schmeiser to court – because of an infraction of their patent rights. The reason: On Schmeiser's land, the surveyors of the firm had found corporate-owned genetically modified seeds, which had been driven there by the wind.

„Without having been able to prevent the contamination, farmers are suddenly required to pay license fees for GM-plants which they never wanted on their fields.“ (P. Schmeiser in: „Danger Genetic Engineering“ v. M. Grössler, p.. 200).

The judge explained to Schmeiser that his entire seeds, whose development had taken him nearly half a century, would now be the property of Monsanto.

„I had planted rape on eight fields then, and sent the seeds of each of these fields to the University of Manitoba in order to find out how much of the conventional seeds was contaminated. The scientists of the university found that half my fields were not contaminated. But because I myself had developed seeds, and because I sow my own seeds each year, there was the possibility that a part of Monsanto's seeds was on the fields which were still not contaminated.

So I even had to cede the profit from these fields to Monsanto. Even worse was that I was not allowed to use my own seeds. I had to give them all to Monsanto. The judge told me that, in Canada, patent rights have priority over the rights of the farmers, which was established in a federal law passed in 1991. “You are not the owner of your own grain any more ... How can a

farmer lose his harvest, seeds, or plants overnight?“ „A lien was put on our entire land and our house.“ („Danger Genetic Engineering“ S. 199)

Monsanto is above the law. In addition to that, the position of this firm is strengthened by the contracts which it signs with the buyers of its seeds. „The judge. ..came to the conclusion ...that, even though the farmers in Canada own, according to federal laws, have the right to use their own seeds from year to year, the patent of Monsanto, nevertheless, has priority over the rights of the farmers!“ (P. Schmeisser in: „Danger Genetic Engineering“ v. M. Grössler, S. 198)

Monsanto wants total control over the seeds market, because they are conscious of the fact that the patent for Round-Up ended three or four years ago, and that the sale of this herbicide has guaranteed 25 % of its world-wide sales and 50% of its profits. The only possibility to secure future sales is to control the world-wide supply of seeds. Within the last five years, Monsanto has bought seed firms from all over the world for more than \$ 12 billion. The corporation now is the world's second-largest seed supplier.

Monsanto is already too powerful and can get everything it wants

The rights to intellectual property (the new patent laws) now have priority over the protection of private property, the interests of the biotechnology corporations have priority over environmental interests, and profits have priority over food production, food quality, and public health.

„In Canada, you really can just because of „a probability“ lose your rights overnight, and this is also the reason why this case has become so well-known worldwide. We should never forget: They are trying to get worldwide control over all seeds, and whoever controls that will control food worldwide! ... For an average citizen, there is no justice, because it is very difficult to file an action against a billion-dollar corporation !“ (P. Schmeiser in: „Danger Genetic Engineering“ v. M. Grössler, S. 198, 199)

Section 3: „The States of the pact ... have ... to support the realisation of the right to self-determination and to respect this right.“

We call upon the Canadian government to protect the right to self-determination and to property by a bill, and to protect farmers with an appropriate number of policemen against the encroachments of the biotech industry. This, of course, also brings a change of the patent laws in favour of the farmers and of the protection of their own seeds. Existing laws, which guarantee the self-determination of the farmers, like the right to breed one's own seeds must also be enforced against the GM corporations. We request the committee to call upon the Canadian government to protect these rights.

3.) Violations of the Right to Work (Article 6)

Section 2: „The steps to be carried out by any State of the pact in order to realize the right includes... steps... to attain productive full employment while protecting the basic political & economic freedom of individuals”

The introduction of GMOs in food production and agriculture is in direct conflict with the basic freedom of people, as they are endangered through patents which increase their dependency on major agro-industrial companies with respect to seeds and the contamination from neighbours including all consequences (see last chapter).

Canadian Farmers, which wanted producing further GM-free, are right now being forced to give up their business or enter into direct dependency on big agribusiness.

In order to secure the freedom, land, property and rights of farmers, we demand that the Canadian government change its laws protecting the farmers from the interests of biotech industries like Monsanto and their methods to take control of the farmers, the seeds and the land. This is the only possibility to secure the working conditions and political and economic basic freedoms of individuals.

4.) **Violations of the rights to appropriate living standards, the right to protection against hunger & the right to food (Article 11)**

Section 1: „The states of the pact agree with the Right ... on ... a continuing progress in living conditions ... and are willing to act accordingly, in order to realize these Rights“

Section 2: „... Right of all people to be protected against hunger“

This right is no longer ensured for most farmers and consumers in Canada.

How many people are concerned in Canada?

In Canada about 4 % of the 30m inhabitants work in agriculture – an important sector of the Canadian economy. Every fourth Canadian either works in the production, processing and sale of foods or in a company which supports the production of foods. Three quarters of Canadian agricultural land is in the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta – however, the southern half of Saskatchewan alone comprises around 50% of the total productive agricultural area of Canada. The farms there cover 400 ha on average and mainly grow cereals. The second most important agricultural area in Canada is in the south-east of Ontario. The farms there are smaller and generally cover between 40 and 180 ha.

The number of working farms has continuously fallen since 1941. In 1941 there were still 732,000 farms; in 1991 there were only 280,000. 867.000 Canadian lived on farms in that year. At the same time, the number of large farms (income of more than 50,000 dollars) has increased: from 111,000 in 1986 to 118.000 in 1993. Half of all agricultural products are exported. (www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/canada-europa/germany/aboutcanada04e-de.asp)

The **greatest danger to securing these right is contamination** and, thus, destruction of livelihoods:

In Canada, 33 samples of certified GM-free seeds have been analysed, whereby 32 were contaminated. (*ISP-report, paper saving version, p. 3*).

“We as Canadians can’t sell a single bushel of canola to the EU anymore. That has lost us a third of our market. Now they want to introduce genetically modified wheat too, even though the Canadian Wheat Board (note: the largest Canadian marketer of wheat) confirms that we would thus lose 80 percent of our market.” (*P. Schmeiser in: “Danger Genetic Engineering” ed. M. Grössler, p. 196*). In this case, buyers in Japan and South Korea would also cancel their contracts with Canada immediately. The GM canola industry was largely shut out of the European market, but other countries were still importing it – and also this continues to change.

Monsanto has been trying to bring genetically modified wheat onto the market for years. After their previous experiences, most of farmers are afraid that the introduction of genetically modified wheat “could drastically reduce their billion-dollar exports to Europe, Japan and other countries, because many countries do not want to buy genetically modified wheat. It has become difficult to separate genetically modified wheat from normal wheat during exporting.” (www.wissenschaft-online.de/abo/ticker//20027 “Monsanto postpone GE wheat to many years” (in German))

Canadian GM free farmers are now demanding damages from Monsanto because they can no longer sell their oil seed rape because of the genetic contamination. “The losses for us farmers run into millions of dollars.... it's not just that we can't sell our canola harvest. We'll never be able ... to grow canola again in the future. We have thus lost an economically valuable plant in crop rotation and we can expect the losses to threaten our very existence, at the latest when genetically modified wheat is introduced genetic manipulation has nothing to do with the improvement of the quality of life in rural areas, ensuring global food supplies or improving the protection of the environment. It's about controlling agricultural production and our foods.” (“*Out of control*” www.saskorganic.com)

“The economic losses due to the introduction of genetically-modified oil seed rape are estimated at over \$ 14m. ... If genetically modified wheat is licensed, economic losses of around \$ 85m could be expected in the same period (10 years), with regard to the loss of the EU as a market.Wheat is such an important organic product that the introduction of genetically modified wheat even creates fears that it would mean the end of organic farming in Saskatchewan.

One of the principal plaintiffs against Monsanto is Dale Beaudoin. He stop cultivating summer rape seed after genetic contamination was found in his harvest in 1999. The rape seed was destined for the European market. Due to this contamination, the sale was cancelled. “My main product is wheat. If genetically modified wheat were to spread in the environment in the same way as genetically modified rape seed, this would certainly result in economic ruin for me as an organic farmer”. (*Press release December 20, 2002, Saskatchewan: Organic farmers apply for permission for a joint action.*)

Dale Beaudoin about the importance of their claim against Monsanto:

“This is no minor issue. It is a matter of independence and survival for all farmers worldwide.” (*Media Release, August 30.2005 Canada: “Organic farmers granted ...”, www.saskorganic.com*)

No insurance company worldwide is willing to take on the risks. \$1 billion were thought to be appropriate for compensating the damage to soil and recovery including the collection of contaminated GMO-products in a judgement in the USA. („*Quadratur des Kreises: das neue Gentechnikgesetz*“, *Environment News of the munich environment institute e. V. Ausgabe 99, April 2004, p. 5*)

Furthermore, contaminated farmers in Canada – not only having just suffered major damages - are also receiving a claim from Monsanto with the background that they use patented GMO-seeds and have to pay with their whole crop, possibly losing their houses in paying the claim etc. In 1998, Monsanto did this for the first time in case of the Canadian farmer Percy Schmeiser, who was sued for the total sale value of his organic plants which were contaminated by a neighbour. The one to suffer is in any case the contaminated farmer losing his livelihood.

Another reason endangering these rights is the threat of dependency of farmers on big agribusiness, which is acting quite unreasonably using false promises:

“Monsanto told the farmers at that time that there would be larger harvests, that everything would be more nutritious and that we would need fewer chemicals!” (*P. Schmeiser, Canadian farmer, in “Danger Genetic Engineering“ ed. M. Grössler, p. 194*)

A contract with agribusiness is needed where seeds as well as pesticides must be bought from the same agribusiness every year in future.” Such contracts are one of the most devilish pacts in the world, a theft of farmers' rights” says Percy Schmeiser (“*The case of Percy Schmeiser against Monsanto*” from Percy Schmeiser in “*Danger Genetic Engineering*“ p. 191). The content of such contracts is e.g. that the farmer is not allowed to reuse his own seeds, he must buy them from

the industry together with the pesticides – and finally the duty to keep silent. Growing GMOs also includes paying royalties in the coming years.

Genetically modified maize produces a lower yield:

“Over a period of three years, Canadian scientists compared the yield of BT maize, into which *bacillus thuringiensis* has been introduced by genetic engineering to protect the plant from insect damage, with that of conventionally grown types. The natural maize yielded up to 12 % more. As it is also cheaper, the researchers thus recommended the cultivation of traditional maize, if only for purely economic reasons. (F. Brandt, www.umwelbund.de, 28.12.2005)

Percy Schmeiser about the situation in Canada:

“So we could see that everything they had told us about the use of less chemicals was wrong and invented. The yield of canola (rape seed) has already fallen by 6.4%. In the meantime, US Department of Agriculture has also had to admit that the yield of soy beans has sunk by at least 15 percent. The genetic engineering companies continue to withhold the fact that the quality is around half as good as that of conventional canola. We thus have less yield, more use of chemicals, a new super weed and significantly lower quality.”

“Danger Genetic Engineering” ed. M. Grössler, p. 196)

I

Gary Smith, agronomist from Canada:

“Canada is currently the fifth-largest producer of organic cereals in the world. We estimate an increase of the turnover of organic products from \$0.7bn in 1997 to \$3.1bn in 2005, which corresponds to an annual growth rate of 20 %.”

(Press release December 20, 2002, www.saskorganic.com, Saskatchewan)

This proves that the future of agriculture is clearly to be found in organic farming and not in the cultivation of genetically engineered plants. The Canadian Government should therefore stop the introduction of GM wheat in order to ensure the livelihoods of its farmers and to prevent a further spread of the cultivation of GMOs.

The follow up of these crop failures was, that in India 25,000 (!) farmers “escaped” this situation by suicide as they saw no way out due to high debts. In Argentina, 10 years after the start-up of GMO-growth, 160,000 farmers have lost their jobs and have nearly nothing to eat. (www.proleben.at/unsl.htm).

A long-term study in Andhra Pradesh/ India showed that GMO-farmers grew less than 60% in the last three years compared to conventional seed farmers. More than 10,000 small scale farmers have nothing left to live on. (www.heise.de / Artikel „Asiatischer Dämpfer für grüne Gentechnologen“ von Gerhard Klas from July 10, 2005).

The living standards – of farmers - as well as consumers – will decrease with the introduction of GMOs in food production and agriculture. “The higher costs of GMO plants including the increased amount of pesticides / herbicides needed, the decrease in yield, the cost of seeds and the reduced market result in a drastic decrease of income for farmers. The first economic analysis of the situation of farmers using bt-corn in USA makes it evident, that the net loss between 1996 and 2001 was \$ 92 million, or \$1.3 per hectare.” (*ISP-report, 15.06.2003, p. 6 – paper saving version*)

For consumers:

Due to GMOs, all food is easily contaminated. Consumers have then only the chance to become ill (see point 5) or to refuse to buy food.

Also in the **guidelines** – based on free will - **of FAO** from November 2004 is written down for the support of a step-by-step realization of the right to appropriate food under the boundaries of national security for food:

“The states of the pact should respect the access to appropriate food by avoiding any activity which might prohibit access to it, and should protect the right of all people to food, which could be endangered by enterprises and individuals which have the intention of prohibiting this access” (*preamble, point 17*). This means that no state should allow GMOs for food production and agriculture as thereby access is prohibited by patenting and royalties, dependency through monopolisation of seeds and the contamination of neighbours, so that harvests are destroyed and enough food is not available anymore.

The state has the duty “to create an environment in which individuals as well as their families are able to take care of their food” (*part II, guideline 1, 1.1*). In order to guarantee this environment any dependency on agribusiness is to be avoided, as the danger exists that pesticides as well as seeds must be consumed. All experiences mentioned before result in the clear statement, that “no sustainable continuation of food supplies” is given with GMO-products (*part II, guideline 2, 2.4*).

In the **General Comment no 12** in respect of the right to food, this obligation to security is clearly formulated (*point 15*): “the right to appropriate food ...creates for the states of the pact ... duties in the form of the obligation towards respect, protection and fulfilment. The obligation towards respect ...means that all steps are to be avoided which might lead to prohibition of access. The obligation of protection means that states ensure that this access is not inhibited by enterprises or individuals. The duty of fulfilment means that states must enhance the access and use of resources and methods ensuring life supply esp. security for food”:

a) “in order to increase the methods for the production, durability and distribution of food with the full aid of technical and scientific knowledge ... as well as by the development or reform of agricultural systems... with the aim of maximum production and use of natural sources”

b) „in order to ensure a corresponding fair distribution of food in the world considering the problems of the exporting and importing countries”.

“There is an accumulation of indications from research that GMOs can result in environmental problems. A lack of data has to be reported concerning the consequences for biodiversity and fertility of soil. It should be clear that biodiversity must not be affected through GMOs” (*Federal Environmental Office, Präsident Prof. Dr. Andreas Troge, www.bmu.de/pressearchiv: „BMU legt Vorschläge für Monitoring-Konzept vor“, Berlin, June 13, 2002*).

“A lie in the propaganda of the GMO-industry was unmasked: it is not true that GMOs need less pesticides but the truth is that GMOs need more pesticides year by year”. (“*More pesticides are sprayed over GMO*”, scientific study by Benbrook in *Ökologo 1/2004, p.2*). An increase of 50-60 % is found (“*Uneconomical in the long run*” by Klaus Faissner in “*Danger Genetic Engineering*”, p.234).

Percy Schmeiser about the situation in Canada:

“...From 1999, significantly more pesticides had to be used on GMO fields on average than on genetic engineering-free fields due to the increasing resistance of weeds.” (“*Danger Genetic Engineering*” ed. M. Grössler, p. 196)

Only in the case of GM corn, two highly effective toxins and one antibiotic enter the soil and food: one insecticide (the toxin of bacillus thuringiensis contains the bt-toxin), one plant toxin (Glyphosate Roundup) and the antibiotic-resistant GM Ampicillin resulting in resistance against antibiotics used in human health care!

All weeds are wiped out. “Those (weeds) exhibiting a better tendency towards survival, however, are going to adapt themselves .. and grow better than before, thus producing herbicide resistant “super-weeds” leading to increased doses. Thus, the increased doses of the pesticides and herbicides result in contamination of the ground water. Experts criticising GMO warned early on that such monocultures would create ecological catastrophes. Another reason for the increased use of pesticides is the appearance of new forms of pests for plants. The scepticism of Europeans was and is justified: expensive GMOs are not improving the economic and ecological situation of agriculture at all” („Über Gentech-Pflanzen wird mehr Gift versprüht“, *wissenschaftliche Studie von Benbrook, Ökologo 1 / 2004*).

However, the use of toxins and antibiotics in the case of food contradicts human rights. As an illustration, the case of the pastureland of the farmer Gottfried Glöckner in Germany, who was the first to use GM corn, should be mentioned here: 3 years after stopping the feeding of his cows with this corn, the soil was contaminated through the bt-toxin in such a way that cows became ill after only one day of grazing.

“10 years after the introduction of GMOs in agriculture it can be stated: none of the promises of agribusiness have come true: neither higher yields nor better ecology. On the contrary, the ecological consequences are a severe catastrophe. Treasures of nature have become a victim of maximization of profit. Through the excessive use of total herbicides, the soils are damaged so much that they are going to lose their fertility soon resulting in a drastic decrease of harvests.” („Gen-Pflanzen erfüllen Erwartungen nicht“ *Andreas Bauer, Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004 p. 25*). In the meantime “a study based on long term analyses established the extensive negative effects of GMOs on flora and fauna” („Gen-Pflanzen erfüllen Erwartungen nicht“, *Andreas Bauer, Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004, p. 23*). Fertility of soils goes down and ground water is contaminated. The access to nature is endangered.

The end result is that through GMOs “the maintenance and sustainable use of natural resources” (*part II, guideline 2, 2.5*) - which is claimed by FAO guidelines – is no longer secured in Canada.

We are asking the government of Canada to follow a policy which allows farmers “to gain a fair income from their work, capital and faculties” (*part II, guideline 2, 2.5*), independent of agroindustries as they intend to enslave them in full dependency. The government should support the access to “suitable and reasonable technology, means of production and financing and stable employment” (*part II, guideline 2, 2.6*) and “to protect the capital which is important for the livelihood of people, especially groups like stockbreeders ...and their relations to natural resources” (*part II, guideline 8, 8.1*).

All these conditions are endangered through the use of GMOs.. It is too expensive and doesn't improve the income and production situations of farmers. Furthermore, all states should inhibit the “decrease of plant genetic resources” and „ensure the protection of the corresponding traditional knowledge and the fair participation in the profit from the use of these resources” (*guideline 8 D, 8.12*), as well as “to consider steps to protect ecologic sustainability and carrying capacity of ecosystems, in order to ensure the production of sustainable food also for future generations, to prohibit water pollution and to protect fertility of soil” (*guideline 8E, 8.13*) and to support farmers “in the application of reliable agricultural techniques” (*guideline 9, 9.5*)

Recently a new study was published in Great Britain (*Proceedings of the Royal Society B*), executed by the Institute for Grassland and Environmental research in Aberystwyth, showing the dangerous consequences of GMOs on natural ecosystems: 11 million US \$ were spent, 150 researchers operated in order to look after 1 million of plants and 2 millions of insects in different parts of Great Britain. The results showed that GMOs drastically decrease the

number of butterflies and bees resulting in severe influences on the birds living from insects. It is clear from this scientific study containing scientific and rational arguments that nature and agriculture are directly linked (*Magazine Nature from March 22, 2005*, <[www. Innovations-report.de/html/berichte/umwelt_naturschutz/bericht-42079.html](http://www.Innovations-report.de/html/berichte/umwelt_naturschutz/bericht-42079.html))

„Genetic engineering fighting against the hunger in the world”

“It is grotesque to identify agro-industries which apply GMOs with all mentioned problems as being able “to solve the problem of hunger”, when they are creating hunger, destroying soils, polluting ecosystems and monopolizing power.” (*„GM-plants don't fulfil expectations“, Andreas Bauer, Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004, p. 24*)

The world's population could be fed quite well without hunger if the distribution of food was carried out together with efforts to maintain or enhance fertility of soils and to maintain biodiversity.

Thus, GMOs in food production and agriculture are not contributing towards solve the problem of hunger, they are intensifying it.

Developing countries have found out, that „GMOs are destroying biodiversity that has been developed during the last thousands of years. Therefore GMOs also destroy the ability of the .. people to feed themselves.” Development policy organisations like “Christian Aid” or “Brot für die Welt“ consider GMOs, the so called “green gencechnology” as contra productive, increasing hunger and poverty.

In short: in order to ensure food security in the world, we must improve the eco-social conditions based on common eco-social standards in connection with the “eco-social market economy”. Any short term increase of yields using purely technical means at the expense of the environment and humans is seen as the wrong way. Economy is based on nature, an destroyed ecosystem will not feed future generations. Sustainably ensuring the food supply therefore needs an agriculture, which maintains nature in its carrying capacity: fertile soil, clean water and air and a great regional biodiversity.” (www.greenpeace.de/themen/gentechnik/ „GMO – no hope for the hungry“ from October 1st, 2004).

In order to improve methods of productions, distribution of food and better use of natural resources we are demanding that the Canadian government forbid the use of GMOs and becomes active at an international level to disseminate the fact that GMOs in food production and agriculture are not solving the problem of hunger, as only a fair distribution of food together with efforts to enhance fertility of soil and biodiversity will contribute towards solving this global problem.

5.) Violation of the Right to Health of Body and Soul (Art. 12)

Section 1: „**The states of the pact accept the right of all people to maximize the health of body and soul**“

“In Canada and the USA, the percentage of people who suffer from allergies has risen dramatically in the last ten years. In Canada, the rate of allergy cases has increased from previously 2 per 10,000 inhabitants to 80 per 10,000 inhabitants now”
(www.oekosmos.de/article/articleview/497/1/6/).

The **FAO-guidelines cite the Declaration of Rome on World Security of Food from 1996**, where “heads of states and governments confirm the right of each human to have access to healthy food” (*preamble, part I point 2*).

Under *point 15* one reads: “security of the food supply exists when all people at any time have physical and economic access to appropriate, healthy and safe food”.

Point 16 means “the step-by-step realization of the right to appropriate food, which requires that states fulfil their duties towards human rights acc. to the Right of People”. In addition to this the availability of food “without unhealthy materials” has to be guaranteed including the duty (*point 17*) to protect this right “against industries and individuals intending to hinder this access.”

In the **General Comment no 12**, under point 10, one can read that states have to ensure that changes in conditions, availability and access do not affect the composition of food.

At the **100th Conference of German Doctors** it was mentioned that risks for human health in the application of GMOs cannot be excluded. The report of the ISP-study (Independent Science Panel) from June 15. 2003 clarifies the essential dangers of GMOs in food-production without hesitation : “We don’t need bio-terrorists if we have genetic engineers” („*The case for a GM-Free Sustainable world*“, ISP, paper saving version, p. 1, London, June 25, 2003). The report is a compilation of evidence, a “strong argument for a worldwide prohibition for the release of GMO” (p.2). “The most important fact is that it was never proven that GMOs are safe. On the contrary, serious experiences were made being sufficient to question the security of GMO for humans and nature.”

Global 2000 is reporting since many years the lack of careful and long term risk assessment of gentech-food („*Erkenntnisreiche Mäusefütterung?*“ from Brigitte Zarzer, October 12, 2004, www.telepolis.de) Gentechology is known at assurance companies to represent incalculable risks with the consequence that no one will take over an assurance for implementing and using GMO!

No additional safety tests are required for the licensing of genetically modified foods, and specific labelling is also not demanded.

“In contrast to Japan and Europe, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) has not carried out a single test on genetically modified seeds or fodder. Only those data were used which had been received from Monsanto.” (P. Schmeiser in: “*Danger Genetic Engineering*” ed. M. Grössler, p. 197)

“Canadians ... question the safety of GM foods. Further, Canadians, have grave doubts about Canada’s food safety regulatory system - a system based, not on independent testing in government labs, but on reviewing data from Monsanto and similar companies. Finally, farmers and consumers cannot trust the government to regulate because it is too busy promoting the GM food industry” (“*Ten Reasons why we don’t want GM wheat*”, National farmers union Canada)

In addition, it has now become known that “in the case of the agreement of the authorities to the introduction of genetically modified wheat, the Canadian Government will receive a royalty from Monsanto for every bushel of wheat (the equivalent of around 35 litres). ... Now we ask ourselves: if the government is to receive royalties from Monsanto for genetically modified wheat, how much has it received from the sales of genetically modified canola for all these years? It’s now coming to light that the government was in league with Monsanto when this company was given the official licenses. (*Percy Schmeiser in “Danger Genetic Engineering” ed. M. Grössler, p. 195*)

The procedure of assessing food security was failing from the beginning as reported by the ISP-study:

- Lack of long term consequences for health (testing was only 28 days, although it is known that damage is becoming evident after 90 days resp. 3 years as in case of pharmaceuticals)
- Ignoring existent scientific results on identified dangers

“When an overwhelming number of scientific studies have proven one thing, it is the fact that these foods should never have received licenses at all.”
(*The Ecologist, May 2004 “Percy Schmeiser”*)

Statements like this are numerous: “the best tested GMO-food”... have no long term study ever executed in the world, we miss scientific studies on health problems for humans (*in the introduction of Klaus Faissner in „Danger Genetic Engineering“, Manfred Grössler, p. 13*). The article of worlds best expert on this area, professor Terje Traavik from Tromsø in Norway in this book (*p.245-253*) is opening the eyes.

As mentioned in the ISP-study the situation is similar to “anti-precaution” ... “in order to enhance the admission of GMO-products at expenses of security (*ISP-Study p. 8*). Acc. to IPS there exist a number of experiments, listed accurately, informing about safety of GMO-food. They have been “overlooked” however. “GMO-food is unacceptable, as they are not at all proven to be safe ... Although a lack of studies on health risk of GMO-products is evident, the existing findings are sufficient as indications for heavy consequences (*p.16*):

- Feeding rats with GM-corn showed, that after 90 days (!) changes in blood, increased blood sugar, inflammation and shrinking of kidney were found (*Prof. Gilles-Eric Séralini, Université de Caen, France*)
- Feeding rats with gentech-potatos resulted in shrinking of organs and destruction of immune systemes. (*Researcher Arpad Pusztai from the scottish Rowett-Institute*). The findings of Pusztai were repeated meanwhile through 23 independent labs and researchers confirming them the result, that the consumption of GMO-food is possibly carcinogenic (*“Initiative for prohibition of gentech-food” www.netlink.de/gen/home.htm, p.3-4*).
- Human cells treated with „Roundup“ herbicide from Monsanto resulted in damage through plant-toxins, possible influence on sexual hormones cannot be excluded together with negative effects on reproduction system including problems during pregnancies (*Prof.Gilles-Eric Séralini, Université de Caen, France in www.zdf.de 25.8.4 “Zu Grunde manipuliert oder optimiert? Experten streiten über Nutzen und Schaden von Genfood”*)
- Feeding of 60 cows with bt-corn lead to sickness of the whole herd after 3 years. Sickness involved sticky diarrhoea, inflammation of inner organs, calcium values in the blood going down to zero, udder being perforated, deformed calves born. Many of them died. (case G. Glöckner)
- Infertility of pigs, cancer like alteration of mice (*Engdhal, Pascalstudy, Paris, 28.1.05 (www.proleben.at)*)
- Anaemie at mouses (*LeMonde, 22.4.04*)

- Gene manipulated DNA can be transferred into bacteria human intestine
- Chicken can exhibit twice as high death rate (in : "Zeitfragen" number 22. 04. of F. W. Engdahl)
- Polls of bt-corn caused massive illnesses of intestines and respiration tracts of farmers in the Philippines living near to fields, where bt-corn was grown. Professor Terje Traavic, director of Norwegian „Institut for Gen-Ecology“ founded that this is due to effect on their immune system caused by the bt-corn. („GM-Plants: Danger for men and environment?“ PM-Magazin 11 / 2004 p. 13)
- For the first time scientists identified traces of GMO in the milk of cows. Up to now agribusiness insisted that this is not the case. This study was locked for 3 years! (WeihenstephanerForschungszentrum für Milch und Lebensmittel Bayern www.diemucha.at, 23.06.04 : Topstory: Augen auf! Gentech raus!)
- studies of feeding rats with gentech-corn producing an insecticide caused damage of health. The corresponding documents have been locked in secrecy by Monsanto and where opened successfully by claim of Greenpeace ("Brisante Experimente", 22.6.05, www.greenpeace.at)
- Studies on mouses is manifesting the transfer of DNA from feed to organisms with possible effects on the immune system (Study of Shaare Zedek Medical Centers Jerusalem, Gastroenterology 2004, Volume 126 – 2).
- Parts of DNA from GM-soya and GM-corn are taken up from lymphatic vessels being transported afterwards by blood circulation system to organs at mice, cows, chicken and pigs. "Even in the milk and in meat traces were found from DNA of the feed. At nematodes it could be shown that DNA from feed can lead to Gen-silencing. These results indicate that risk assessment up to now was seen too narrow focussing on proteins only. Clearly the existing data for assessing food security in case of GM-Roundup-Ready-Soya and bt-corn is not at all sufficient (Werner Müller, Gentechnologyexpert of Austrian Environmental Organsiation Global 2000 in „Erkenntnisreiche Mäusefütterung?“, Birgitte Zarzer, 12.10.04, www.telepolis.de)
- independent scientist identify regularly in studies with animals drastic alterations of kidneys, lever and blood caused by GMO (Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004 S. 23)
- since the implementation of GMO in USA 8 years before the illnesses caused by food show an increase of 40% (Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004 p. 23) representing a two to ten fold increase (ISIS report from november 3, 2001: "illnesses caused by food increased two to ten fold in USA")
- "the drastic increase of allergies and other illnesses is possibly caused by pesticides" (British Society for Allergy, Environmental und Nutritional Medicine, „The case for a GM-free sustainable world“, paper saving version, ISP june 15. 2003, p. 25)
- it cannot be excluded that transgenic DNA penetrating the genom of animal cells causes an initiation of cancer. Possibly the feed stuff of GMO is enhancing this risks also at humans consuming GM products from animals. ("The case for a GM-free sustainable world", paper saving version, ISP 15.06.2003 p. 3 / 4).
- GM-products are potentially more dangerous then traditional food products: Genology is introducing new dangerous allergenic and toxins into food. GM-bacteria used for the increase of production of tryptophan as food additive resulted to the death of 37 persons and 1500 people with permanent paralysis due to unidentified toxic by products (see "GM-food a serious menace of health" p.4, www.netlink.de/gen/fagand.html). The cousine of an Austrian farmer was effected by this pharmaceutical: the assurance was paying a social insurance, while the producers of this product were not made responsible..
- "There are lots of publications of scientific studies concerning the increased use of Glyphosate as main pesticide (Roundup), which is responsible for a great threat for human health as well as for animals and nature" (ISP-study "The case for a GM-free sustainable world" from june 15. 2003, p.11)

- Researchers from the York Food Lab found out that allergies caused by soya lead to an increase of 50% in the last year. The study made by Europe's leading experts in food security showed, that problems with GM-Soya, which is the most used genetic food, increased from 10 to 15% last year. "this provides real evidence of the immense danger for human health" ("*allergies caused by soja has increased drastically in the last year*" www.netlink.de/gen/Zeitung/999/9903/2b.htm)
- In USA the redemption of food contaminated by GM-products resulted in costs of more than 1 billion of US\$! Thus, it is clear, that this was caused by GMO, which are seen not to be safe and without risks (p.15).

All together, these cases are showing that the "substantial equivalence" between natural food and genetic food is not valid!

"Until today the long term risks of GM-food are unknown. Economic interests of only few big agro-industries must not have priority over health of millions of consumers" (Philipp Mimkes from the Coordination against Bayer-dangers in a press release from february 11 2004 „Großbritannien: Erneuter Rückschlag für Gentech-Programm von Bayer CropScience“, www.cbgnetwork.org.)

„Based on the drastic lack of knowledge about risks for health and consequences for ecology as well as for economy the approval of commercial release of GMO is not acceptable“ („*Transgene Pflanzen im Freiland: Situation in Europa und Forderungen des Umweltinstitutes München e. V.*“ www.umweltinstitut.org, Petra C. Fleissner, *Umweltnachrichten* 82 / 1998).

All these facts are the list of suspicious risks of GMO: " more and more scientific studies suggest that DNA from food can have drastic effects on human organism: in the sense of a maximum of precaution all these unknown facts must be clarified. The release of GM-food is, thus, in strongest contradiction to responsibility for life" (www.telepolis.de „*Erkenntnisreiche Mäusefütterung?*“.. B. Zarzer, 12.10.04).

a) „... Improving all aspects of hygiene of environment & at work

Caused by the drastically increased input of pesticides connection with GMO the environment as well as the working conditions of farmers will be damaged very strong in the handling of these things including neighbours (s. point 4, Section 2 a and point 5 / summary of studies).

b) „.... Preventing ... sicknesses at work and other areas“

The use of GMO in Canada leads to a further intensification of the use of pesticides and therefore to a drastic threat for health of working people.

Percy Schmeiser about the situation of the farmers in Canada:

"In Saskatchewan we use a third of all the chemicals - insecticides, herbicides and pesticides - which are employed in Canada, and we have the highest cancer rate. ... I haven't got a single neighbour who hasn't had cancer, and only one of them is still alive. I'm the only one who hasn't become ill. Particularly alarming is the fact that in villages with 400 or 500 inhabitants you can often find children – babies under the age of one – who are already suffering from cancer, and it is not unusual that there are four or five such babies in a single village." ("Percy Schmeiser" in : *The Ecologist* May 2004)

Known risks for health (increase in allergies, death of cows, alterations at rats, deformed at birth, identified DNA etc) are evidently tolerated instead of carrying out through long term research, existing studies were ignored or even hold back in secrecy.

The increased use of pesticides is enhancing sicknesses at work as shown further on this place:

“broadly active herbicides are highly toxic for humans and other species: Glufosinat-Ammonium and Glyphosate are released through herbicide-tolerant transgenic plants representing worldwide 75% of transgenic plants. Both are systemic metabolic toxins which are thought to lead to damaging effects, which are proven in some cases. ... Glyphosate is the most common reason for diseases and toxifications in Great Britain.. Huge rates of dysfunction of the body are reported using just “normal” amounts of toxins. Contact with Glyphosate is doubling the risk of breaking off pregnancies spontaneously or even later on. Children were born having increased diseases in behaviour due to damaged nervous system when people applied Glyphosate. ... Roundup (based on Glyphosate) causes disfunctioning of cell division correlated with initiation of cancer. Known effects ... are thought to be seriously enough in order to stopp any further use of such herbicides” (*„The case for a GM-free sustainable world“, ISP, paper saving version, june 15 2003, S.3*)

6.) Violations of the right for freedom in sciences and research (Art. 15)

Section 3: „The states of the pact agree to respect the freedom in respect to the creative work as a prerequisite for scientific research”

Freedom in research is no longer given! 95% of scientists in the area of genetics & genetic engineering work dependently in direction of industry. In case they produce data and result, which are not in agreement with expectations of industry are punished by loosing their job and/or loosing financing and materials for the research (“*A film for Life*”, Bertram Verhaag in “*Danger Genetic Engineering*”, p. 183-186).

“There are various reasons for the widespread distribution of transgenic plants. Extensive research has revealed that manipulation by the biotech industry and its close cooperation with politics play a decisive role in the increasing application of this new technology in the USA. For example, no additional safety tests are required for the licensing of genetically modified foods, and specific labelling is also not demanded. In addition to this, hardly any critical reports are published. On the part of the industry, every effort is made to prevent negative influences from being exerted.” (“*The genetic engineering boom in the USA*” farmernewspaper, No. 49/2005)

“Risks are being played down unscrupulously here, research results are doctored, critics threatened, evidence stolen and sceptics are silenced.” (*Random house special about J.M.Smith: “Trojan Seeds”, December 2004*). It is shown “that it is the influence of the industry which has opened the market for these foods, and not reliable scientific investigations. ... Just as breathtaking as the immense plans of the industry are its manoeuvres to distort and disguise the truth.” (*J. F. Smith “Trojan Seeds” p. 15 / 16*)

“Nearly all transgenic plants are admitted in USA, where security tests are based on “consultation by free will” of gentech-industry. They are deciding, which data are given to the administration body. This means, that industry is making the admission themselves! ... This fact is a scandal by itself, but is even worth by infiltration of authorities through employees of gentech-industry!” (“*GM-plants don’t fulfil expectations*“, *Andreas Bauer, Umweltnachrichten 100 / 2004*).

Thus, the independent state of scientists is regarded as one key factor. “There has been a history of misrepresentation and suppression of scientific evidence ... Many experiments were not followed up ... (*ISP „The case for a GM-free sustainable world“, paper saving version, june 15, 2003, p.9*)

The findings in case of the cows damaged from bt-corn (G.Glückner /germany) disappeared, obviously in order to maintain silence and order.

In case of pharmaceuticals, 7 to 10 years are needed for research before admission is given. Thus, how long must research been carried out in case of GM-food products effecting 450 millions of people? GMO are irreversible!

“Furthermore it is unbelievable that beyond the lack of long term studies the studies of the eco-social consequences have been carried by the applicants themselves!” We can conclude, what already was written before, that the main part of scientists as well as other industries is totally dependent from agro-business. (“*Ausgeblendete Risiken*” from *Werner Müller and A. Velimirov in „Danger Genetic Engineering“, Manfred Grössler, p. 237- 239*). The only chance, thus, is that society

by itself will spent money for carrying out serious independent research. This to secure is the canadian government now demanded.

Already in 1998 a lawyer in USA was elucidating internal acts showing that the American government is misleading worlds population in case of health risks, caused by GMOs in food. A publication of FDA, the American Food & Drug Administration, responsible for admission, showed that the warnings of American researchers were ignored and that facts were illustrated in a wrong way in order to help biotech-industry! Nearly 10 years official FDA was misleading the public in case of GMO-food! Later on the FDA admitted that they were forced to act in this way. Written documents from FDA researchers show clearly that original lab-data on GMO-food are proving the health risks! Officials with the FDA ignored these statements by stating that there are no health risks, thus, gentech-food is substantially equivalent to natural food and need no security checks! (*“US-lawyer is unveiling: american government is misleading the world about health risks of gentech-food”* in www.netlink.de/gen/druker.htm and www.biointegrity.org).

Creative work is completely impossible for farmers under such conditions as they are not allowed to grow their own seeds, and only patented seeds exist. Rice, a main food in Asia, also was recently applied for patent rights, e.g. in India while 200 original sorts of regionally adapted rice are collected by farmers. This independency obviously is intended to be broken from Monsanto...However the GM-plants are not adapted to regional soil and conditions! TRhe bio-tech industry wants farmers to pay royalties, which leads to slavery, threatens their existence and has already resulted in collective suicides.

7.) Steps for ensuring Rights of farmers and consumers

- Definitive prohibition of the licensing of genetically modified wheat
- Compensation for organic farmers for the losses caused by the development and marketing of genetically engineered rape seed.
- Full responsibility of the firms for all consequences
- Objective and independent monitoring of all foods with regard to GMOs
- A prohibition of any use of GMO for food and feed until the potential risks are proven to not exist for eco-social consequences using long term research
- Accurate research on known risks for health of humans and nature
- Long term research executed by independent scientists
- Prohibition of GMO in the area of food production and agriculture in Canada
- prohibit the import of GMO
- obligation to label all GMO-products
- implementation of liability through agro-industries for all damages
- prove that member of commissions and decision groups are independent and include NGO's into commissions
- guarantee the transparency of decisions
- ensuring and protecting the interests of farmers and consumers in direction of sustainable agriculture and food production against the interests of lobbies from GMO-industries
- Amendment of patent laws in favour of the rights of farmers
- Implementation of existing laws for the protection of farmers, thus guaranteeing that the rights of farmers are maintained - without exceptions - by sufficient security forces and an appropriately functioning jurisdiction. Violations of the law (theft, blackmail, breaking and entering etc.) have to be penalised immediately and severely, in order to prevent further threats to farmers.

Summarizing it becomes clear, that the government of Canada has not fulfilled its duties to follow national laws and constitution as well as the corresponding duties on the international level. For the Canadian population this means an existential and irreversible threat of its health and food security. Life of many individuals is endangered caused by the inactivity of the government leading potentially to total loss.

We are demanding from the Canadian government to protect its population against unemployment and the increase in poverty but also to ensure access to healthy food in a sustainable way!

We are therefore asking the committee to clearly express its concerns and to urgently act in such a way that the violations of human rights for farmers and consumers in Canada are stopped as well as to ensure their observance by sustainable legislation based on the arguments given here.